Review and Expositor

Vol. LII JULY, 1955 No. 3

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION 287

THE PRIMARY EMPHASIS IN CHRISTOLOGY 290
By Guy H. Ranson

THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION—
Part III. The Church Fathers 310
By Dale Moody

WHEN RELIGION AND PSYCHOTHERAPY MEET 325
By R. Lofton Hudson

SPECIALIZED SEMINARY TRAINING
FOR THE RURAL MINISTER 336
By Carl A. Clark

BAPTIST PRINCIPLE UNDER TRIAL 343
By James M. Bulman

BOOK REVIEWS 383

INDEX TO BOOKS REVIEWED 431

Review and Expositor

A BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Edited by the Faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

VOL. LII, No. 3 JULY, 1955

EDITORIAL STAFF

DUKE K. McCALL Editor-in-chief
H. C. GOERNER Managing Editor
TAYLOR C. SMITH Book Review Editor
GUY H. RANSON Business Manager

* * *

Publication Office: 2825 Lexington Road, Louisville 6, Ky.

Correspondence: Concerning articles and editorial matters, kindly address the Managing Editor; concerning books and reviews, the Book Review Editor; concerning advertisements and business matters, the Business Manager; concerning subscriptions, the Circulation Secretary, Mrs. Davis C. Hill.

Subscription Rates: $3.00 per year in advance; two years for $5.00; three years, $7.00. Single copies, 75 cents.

Indexed in **Index to Religious Periodical Literature**, published by the American Theological Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.

Set up and printed by **Western Recorder Press**, 127 E. Broadway, Louisville, Ky.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Louisville, Ky., July 19, 1918, under acts of Congress of March 3, 1879 and of October 3, 1917 (Section 1103).

Editorial Introduction

"What think ye of Christ?" has been the key question of Christian thought and life. The nature of his person, his relation to the Father, his position in the Godhead—all are inevitably related to one's conception of his power to save and his availability as cosmic Friend and Guide. A "low Christology" must lead eventually to a low level of ethical and spiritual power. A "high Christology" furnishes the strongest dynamic for Christian living. It is therefore not surprising to find a professor of Christian Ethics deeply concerned with modern Christological thought. The article in which Dr. Guy H. Ranson points out the contemporary recovery of the high Christology of the Bible and of the early Church was first delivered, in substance, as two lectures before the annual conference of Seventh-Day Baptist ministers at Farina, Illinois, May 3-6, 1954. Ranson teaches Christian Ethics at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Intimately related to one's Christology is his view of the birth of Christ—the manner of his entrance into history. It might be said that Professor Dale Moody has been seeking to help Christians of today recover a "high" concept of the Virgin Birth. A "low" concept might be quite insistent upon the virginity of Mary, the mother of Jesus, (even to the point of claiming her perpetual virginity, as does the Roman Catholic Church) and might yet leave the matter on a basically biological level, subject to being compared with supposed instances of parthenogenesis in pagan mythology. A "high" concept of the birth of Christ goes far beyond questions of virginity and the absence of a human father to the ultimate and basic fact of conception by the Holy Spirit. It centers in a positive affirmation, not a negative denial. The current article by Moody is the third and last in a series. Part One was published in October, 1954, and Part Two in January, 1955.

Dr. R. Lofton Hudson is pastor of Wornall Road Baptist Church, Kansas City, Missouri. He has been widely recognized for the success of his counseling ministry. He has

written two books on the subject, and many denominational publications carry as a regular feature his column dealing with personal problems. In his current article he addresses himself to basic questions on the relationship of psychotherapy to the pastoral ministry.

Professor Carl A. Clark has recently joined the faculty of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary as Associate Professor in the department of Rural Church Work. He issues a ringing call for more help for the country church, both in numbers and in the quality of training of its ministry.

Our last issue carried an article by Dr. W. W. Barnes on "Churches and Associations among Baptists," along with some editorial comment upon the bearing of this article upon the now famous "North Rocky Mount Case." Attention was called to the revised decision of the North Carolina Supreme Court, which removed a reference to the "general church." There was perhaps a note of finality in our closing statement: "The revised decision is now in line with historic Baptist principles, as these are pointed out by Professor Barnes."

This statement of the Managing Editor has been seriously challenged by Dr. James M. Bulman, pastor of the East Spencer Baptist Church, East Spencer, North Carolina. Following our announced policy of printing both sides of controversial issues, we are glad to publish herewith Bulman's article, "Baptist Principle Under Trial." It will be readily seen that the author goes far beyond a criticism of our editorial. We regret that he finds it necessary to call names and deal in personalities to a certain extent. But a careful reading has convinced us that this is not a personal attack upon any of the denominational leaders who are named. Bulman is dealing with the basic principle involved, and finds it necessary to quote from testimony made during the trial in order to establish his argument. His attitude and purpose are not to be confused with those of some other individuals who are agitating this question with the apparent motive of sustaining the theological position of the majority in the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church, which withdrew from the Southern Baptist Convention, and thus to further the

charges of "modernism" within the Convention. It is important to distinguish between the *theological* issues and the *ecclesiological* issue involved in the case. Bulman is a graduate of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, holding its highest degree. He is pastor of a fully cooperating Baptist church, within the North Carolina Baptist Convention. He has raised a question which cannot be lightly brushed aside. He has forced us to face again the question, raised editorially in the July, 1954 issue: "What has happened to the idea so often and so fondly stated, that a Baptist church is the best example of a pure democracy and the rule of the majority?"

We do not believe that Bulman has said the last word on this subject. Doubtless there will be those who wish to answer his argument. The *Review and Expositor* is not taking sides in the debate, but opening its columns for the discussion of this highly important question. Even in the light of the Supreme Court's revision of the wording of the decision of the Superior Court, our statement in July, 1954 seems to stand: "There is a *principle* involved in this decision, and with that principle we are concerned and believe that our readers are concerned. If the right principle has been discovered and followed, well and good. But let us recognize the principle and its implications. Something is happening to Baptist ecclesiology. Let us have our eyes open to what is happening." What happens in North Carolina ultimately involves us all.

Our concluding article on "The World Mission of the Church" brings us back to the central task for which all the churches exist. The author, Dr. Robert G. Bratcher, is a missionary of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, serving as Professor of New Testament in the South Brazil Baptist Theological Seminary in Rio de Janeiro. On furlough during the past year, he has been Visiting Professor of New Testament Interpretation at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. His message was delivered in the chapel of the Seminary on February 23, 1955, and made a profound impression upon students and faculty.

The Primary Emphasis in Christology

BY GUY H. RANSON

The proper center of Christology is the personal Lord who unites God and men in personal relationships. Modern theology has been largely unmindful that this is the center of the Christian faith. In Roman Catholicism the personal Jesus has been transformed into an impersonal power which releases an ointment of grace which can be distributed by the church. In Protestant Liberalism the Lord has become the ideal natural man who leads men into the good life. In Protestant Fundamentalism Christ has become the supernatural payment of an infinite debt to assure some men of eternal happiness. Each of these fails to emphasize the personal God-man who reconciles God and men and brings them into personal communion. It is needful therefore that we recover the historical and Biblical witness to this central truth of the Christian faith.

I. Christology in the History of Christian Thought

Christendom has been blessed both by the early pattern of Christology which emphasized the personal Lord and by a continuous witness in the Church to this Lord.

Irenaeus — The Pattern of Christology

The pattern for orthodox Christology was formulated by Irenaeus about 180 A.D. in his great work *Against Heresies.* He was the first of the Fathers to deal in a definitive way with Christology, and we are greatly indebted to him for the clarity with which he states the personal nature of incarnation and atonement and the way in which they complement each other. Concerning the incarnation Irenaeus asks, "Why did He descend? Was it that He might bring that truth which was already known . . .?"[1] He answers,

> For it was for this end that the word of God was made man, and He who was the Son of God became the Son of man, that man, having been taken into the

1. *Against Heresies,* II, xiv. 7. English translation in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* I, 315-567 (Buffalo: Christian Literature Co., 1886).

> Word, and receiving the adoption, might become the son of God. For by no other means could we have attained to incorruptibility and immortality, unless we had been united to incorruptibility and immortality. But how could we be joined to incorruptibility and immortality, unless, first, incorruptibility and immortality had become that which we also are, so that the corruptible might be swallowed up by incorruptibility, and the mortal by immortality, that we might receive the adoption of sons?[2]

Concerning the atonement Irenaaeus says,

> For it was incumbent upon the Mediator between God and men, by His relationship to both, to bring both to friendship and concord, and present man to God, while He revealed God to man. For, in what way could we be partakers of the adoption of sons, unless we had received from Him through the Son that fellowship which refers to Himself, unless His Word, having been made flesh, had entered into communion with us? Wherefore also He passed through every stage of life, restoring to all communion with God.[3]

According to Irenaeus sin and death came upon man when he rejected the source of life and righteousness. By asserting his independence of God, man became a sinner and was dead. He lost fellowship with his Father and fell under the control of the Devil. Thus there is enmity between God and man.[4] The only way in which God's order can be restored is by the reconciliation of God and man by one who is both God and man. The restorer of the order is the very same God who created the order. Thus the atonement does not placate the Father but fulfills his will by restoring man to fellowship with him where man can again accept his dependence upon God.[5] Irenaeus maintains, against the Gnostics, the full deity of Christ and clearly and distinctly says that he is not a creature, or an emanation, or an activity

---

2. *Ibid.*, *III.* xix. 1.
3. *Ibid.*, III. xviii. 7.
4. *Ibid.*, IV. xxxix-xli.
5. *Ibid.*, V. xiv-xv.

of God.[6] In order to redeem man it was necessary that the eternal Word of God, who is God Himself,[7] should become consubstantial with man.

> For that thing is reconciled which had formerly been in enmity. Now, if the Lord had taken flesh from another substance, He would not, by so doing, have reconciled that one to God which had become inimical through transgression.[8]

By his perfect obedience and death, Christ overcame the Devil who had induced man to follow him into disobedience. Thus by Christ's obedience the disobedient tyrant, the Devil, was overcome. By this obedience, also, God and man were reconciled. Both in life and in death there is the perfect submission of Christ to the Father. Thus in the incarnation and the atonement the will of God is perfectly fulfilled, and this will was to give unto man eternal or immortal life which is fellowship with God, and in which sin and death are overcome.

Irenaeus clearly affirms that Christ is both God and man and that he is neither a creature nor an emanation of God. The two sides of this affirmation, the deity of Christ and the humanity of Christ, were to be stated by Athanasius and Leo I respectively. Their statements were given definitive formulation in the councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon respectively.

The Nicene Creed — The Deity of Christ

The Nicene Creed affirms,

> We believe . . . in one Lord JESUS Christ, the Son of God, only-begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance of the Father, GOD of GOD, light of light, very GOD of very GOD, begotten, not made, being of the same substance with the Father, by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, was incarnate, was made man, suffered, rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens, and

6. *Ibid.*, II. xiii.
7. *Ibid.*, II. xviii. 8.
8. *Ibid.*, V. xiv. 3.

> He will come to judge the living and the dead. . . . Those who say, There was a time when He was not, and He was not before He was begotten, and He was made of nothing (He was created), or who say that He is of another hypostasis, or of another substance (than the Father), or that the Son of God is created, that He is mutable, or subject to change, the Catholic Church anathematizes.[9]

This creed came as the result of the Arian controversy, and the point in question is the divine nature of Christ and his relationship to the Father. The controversy arose in Alexandria, Egypt, about 318 A.D. when Arius, a priest of the diocese of Alexandria, who had been educated in Antioch, Syria, challenged the Christology of Alexander, Bishop of the church in Alexandria. Arius most clearly sets forth his views in a letter to Alexander. He says that "There is only *one* true God, alone uncreate, alone eternal, alone without beginning, alone wise, good, and powerful; one only Judge and King, and alone unchangeable." Before all time this God "begot His only Son, and by Him created the world and all things," and God actually called Him into existence by His own will, as an unchangeable and immutable being." This "Son is a perfect creature of God, but yet distinct from all other creatures." Christ "was created by the will of God before time, and before all worlds" and yet "He was not until He was begotten; but He was begotten before all time, before all things, and He alone was called by the Father (immediately) into being. He is not, however, eternal or unbegotten, like the Father."[10]

In conclusion, Arius says that Father and Son are not of the same essence or substance. He thus sees Christ as neither God nor man, but as an order of being between deity and humanity. Arius bases his conclusions upon Proverbs 8:22-24.

The debated point with regard to the Son is stated very clearly in the Creed. The Son is begotten of the Father's

9. C. J. Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, I, 294-295 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1870, 2nd edition).
10. *Ibid.*, I, 254-256.

essential being, of the same substance with the Father. The Son of God is himself deity, and it is deity that makes him what he is, and he shares the very same being as the Father. He is identical in being (*homoousion*) with the Father. This divine Son came down for our salvation and was made man.

In the years following the Council of Nicaea the controversy continued and grew more heated. The participants in the dispute can be grouped into four parties. First is the Old Nicene Party, led after A.D. 330 by Athanasius, and characterized by the assertion that Father and Son are of the same substance (*homoousion*), that Christ was begotten, not made, and that He is eternal. Second are the consistent Arians, led by Eunomius, Aetius, and Eudoxius, who say that the Son is unlike the Father (*anomoion*) both existentially and ethically. Third is the Neo-Nicene Party, led by the Cappadocians, who say that the Son is like the Father in essential being (*homoiousion*) but not identical (*homoousion*) because they wish to escape any suggestion of Sabellianism, that is, that the Father and Son are identical in person as well as in substance. Fourth are the political Arians, led by Ursacius and Valens, who say, in completely noncommittal fashion, that the Son is like the Father (*homoion*) in some way other than in essential being.

The hero of the Arian Controversy is Athanasius. His most important Christological works[11] were written during the controversy but before the Council of Nicaea, *i.e.* between 318 and 325 A.D. He saw most clearly of all the disputants that redemption is dependent upon God and not upon a creature. He thought that those who made Christ a creature were either polytheists, worshipping two gods, or idolators, worshipping God and a creature. In order to preserve the Christian witness of the essential deity of Christ, Athanasius suffered much abuse including being exiled five times.

After about 362 A.D. Athanasius came to see that the

11. *Against the Heathen* and *Incarnation of the Word*. English translations in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd Series, IV, 1-67 (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1892).

Neo-Nicene Party was actually in agreement with him. Thus he and they united in asserting that there is one divine essence which is common to Father and Son who differ numerically. Father and Son are identical in essence but distinct in person. The Cappadocians include the Holy Spirit in Godhead, and thus they come to the Greek formula: "One *ousia;* three *hypostases.*" This same formula had been worked out in Latin more than a century earlier by Tertullian in the formula: "One substance; three persons." Each formula affirms Christ to be fully God in a non-Sabellian sense. The Nicene Creed, understood in this way, was reaffirmed by the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D.[12]

The Symbol of Chalcedon — The Humanity of Christ

The formula which states the humanity of Christ was promulgated by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. The formula affirms that men are to confess

> the Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in Manhood: truly God and truly man, of a reasonable [rational] soul and body; consubstantial [coessential] with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in the latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably;* the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons. . . .[13]

The formula of Chalcedon takes up in detail the nature of the humanity of Christ and excludes as heretics those who are extreme, to the one side or the other, as touching

12. Hefele, *op. cit.,* II, 349-351.
13. Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom,* II, 62-63 (New York: Harper, 1878).

the two natures in one person. Extreme on the side of emphasis upon the one nature are Appolinaris, the Monophysites Eutyches and Dioscurus, and Cyril of Alexandria. Extreme on the other side of emphasis upon two distinct natures are Nestorius and the Nestorians. It is necessary to distinguish Nestorius and the Nestorians, although it is really impossible to say that Nestorius was not a Nestorian. It depends largely on his use and meaning of *Prosopon* in *The Bazaar of Heracleides.*[14]

The affirmation in the symbol that Christ is of a reasonable or rational soul is directed against Apollinaris who had said that it is impossible to affirm complete Godhead and complete manhood of the same person. In accordance with the common opinion in Greek philosophy he says that there are three factors in any human self, and these are body, animating soul, and rational soul. The body is matter and is in itself lifeless. The animating soul is the principle of life in the body. The rational soul is that which is distinctly human and distinguishes man from animal. Now, says Apollinaris, in the Christ there is a human body and a human animating soul, but in the place of the human rational soul there is the divine Logos. Apollinaris is correct in seeing that what is human is truly human, and that what is divine is truly divine. His error lies in making a conjunction of a complete divinity with a partial humanity, which precludes a complete or genuine incarnation. The part of man which must be redeemed, the rational, is not affected at all, and thus man is still in sin.[15] This clearly was out of bounds and had to be condemned.

Apollinaris was truly concerned to defend the redeeming activity of Christ. He feared that to assert a complete incarnation, *i.e.*, a full humanity in Jesus, was to say that Jesus was a sinner. If Jesus had assumed complete human nature, Apollinaris reasons, he would have in himself the

14. Nestorius, *The Bazaar of Heracleides,* edited by G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925).

15. See Gregory Nazienzen's letter to Nestorius (Epistle CCII) *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* Second Series, VII, 438.

fallen human nature and thus be by nature a sinner. His error here rests in his assumption that originally Adam had an independent power of himself to avoid sin and that the Fall consisted in losing this. Athanasius makes this same error and thus has difficulty in answering Apollinaris. Gregory of Nyssa sees this issue more clearly and shows that only by assuming our human nature in its entirety could Christ redeem us.[16] F. D. Maurice has shown more clearly than anyone in recent Christian thought the error of assuming that Adam had an independent righteousness and an independent power to maintain it. He shows clearly that Adam's righteousness was dependence upon God and his unrighteousness was dependence upon self and declaring himself independent of God. In the incarnation, Maurice says, the pre-existent Christ was united with human nature and by His obedience and dependence upon God while in this human nature all men are restored to union with God. Anything short of this is not true incarnation and will not redeem man.[17]

The Monophysites, Eutyches and Dioscurus, maintain that there were two natures before the union but that the human was absorbed by the divine in their union in Christ leaving only the divine. They say that the human remained in the divine only as a drop in the sea. This teaching was excluded by the affirmation of the Symbol of Chalcedon which says that Christ is "to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeably.*" Many years later the desire to find one center, the divine, for Christ was attempted by saying there is but one will. The proponents of this view were called Monothelites. They, including Pope Honorius of Rome, were condemned in the Sixth General Council in 680 A.D., which reaffirmed the formula of Chalcedon.

The position of Cyril was not as pointedly excluded as

16. See J. F. Bethune-Baker, *History of Christian Doctrine,* 250-252. (London, Methuen, 1933).

17. F. D. Maurice, *The Doctrine of Sacrifice* (London: Macmillan, 1879); *The Patriarchs and Lawgivers,* Sermon II (London: Macmillan, 1892).

it might have been. He says that Christ was truly man and truly God. He is in agreement with Nicaea on the deity, and he also thinks of Christ as having a completely human nature, but for him it was universal or abstract humanity and not individual. Failure to exclude Cyril's position more pointedly has permitted people in later times to fail to emphasize the individual human personality without realizing their error in not doing so.

The Symbol says that Jesus was "born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood;" and this is directed against Nestorius, who had provoked the controversy by attacking Cyril for using the term, "Mother of God." The term, "Mother of God," did not mean in the Greek language what it is often assumed to mean in English. It did not emphasize the glory of Mary, but it emphasized that Jesus who was born in the flesh was also God. To deny that Mary was the Mother of God was to deny that He who was born of her was God as well as man. What this term teaches is that the Son of God in assuming manhood from Mary lost nothing of the Godhead which was eternally his. Nestorius insists that God had no human mother. He says Mary was the mother of the human person only. He maintains that there were two persons in Jesus, one human and one divine, and they became one in him. The language is too ambiguous for us to know precisely what he means, but it certainly is not a clear assertion of two natures in one person. The followers of Nestorius had maintained that the human and divine natures in Jesus existed together but were not really united. Thus the "indivisibly" and "inseparably" were directed against them.

Now, what has been said in this Symbol of Chalcedon? It reaffirms Nicaea with regard to the deity by saying that our Lord Jesus Christ is "*homoousion* (consubstantial or coessential) with the Father according to the Godhead." It goes on to say that He is "*homoousion* with us according to the Manhood." This means that He truly became an individual in whom the humanity was complete. It was not human nature in general, but real individual humanity. He

was "in all things like unto us, without sin." This means that he was tempted in all parts as we are, and yet he did not renounce His dependence upon the Father, and thus through perfect obedience, sin and death were overcome in the flesh, and thus he was able to accomplish our salvation. The two natures (and in 680 A.D. the two wills) were preserved, each in its own property, and they concurred in one person and one subsistence.

A primary weakness in this symbol is that the living Lord takes a subordinate place in favor of the metaphysical formula. This tendency to think of Christ as contained in an intellectual formula has plagued Christology since Chalcedon. Certainly Maurice, Baillie, Mackintosh, and others have been correct in protesting against the de-personalization of our Lord. Christ himself revealed the Mediator through personal relationships primarily, and only secondarily through ideas. The reversal of this in Chalcedon was unfortunate. However, the formulators of the Chalcedonian symbol laid a foundation more firm and enduring than they themselves realized. It has remained a bulwark against repeated one-sidedness in Christology since its inception.

The Middle Ages

The theologians of the Middle Ages, for the most part, preserved the correct formula of Christology, maintaining the full humanity and the full deity. However, it was only in words and in practical piety, particularly in Bernard of Clairvaux and those who emphasized the imitation of Christ, that the humanity was emphasized in actuality. H. R. Mackintosh[18] maintains that the Monophysite slanting of the Symbol of Chalcedon was exploited and that the medieval emphasis was really upon the deity, and the humanity of the person of Jesus retreated almost out of sight. This was aided by the development of the doctrine of Transubstantiation and by increased interest in the intervention of the Virgin Mary on behalf of man. Moreover, Christology was

18. H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, 225-228 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

colored by the soteriology in which an external satisfaction was made for man, a satisfaction in which man was not an actual participant. The medieval scheme of sacramental grace obscured the living Lord and there was little of personal relationship with him. However, when Adoptionism and Docetism claimed official recognition they were rejected as heretical. In Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus we see what is all but Monophysite doctrine affirmed, because Christ as a metaphysical principle takes priority over the living Lord of life. Their formulas about the relation of the divine and human in Christ are correct, but they lose sight of the personal Jesus of the Gospels. Christ becomes almost entirely a metaphysical principle by which saving grace is given as an ointment mediated to those who will submit to the institutional church. The Incarnation is minimized and a satisfaction theory of atonement becomes primary in the work of Anselm.[19] To him, in effect, Christ's humanity is subsumed under his divinity. Christ is essentially God acting a role as man, and salvation becomes an external transaction rather than a personal relationship in which men are raised to newness of life.

The Reformation

"It is not too much to say that with the Reformation and especially with Luther, there came into the world a deeper understanding of the Person of Christ than had prevailed since the apostolic age."[20] Thus does Professor Mackintosh aptly state the Reformers' recovery of the Biblical and apostolic understanding of the person of Christ. The hidden God becomes the revealed God in Jesus of Nazareth, the Jesus who lived and suffered that God and man might be reconciled. For the Reformers, Jesus Himself is our salvation. Attention is thus turned primarily to Jesus the personal Redeemer rather than to an abstract dogma or to an in-

19. Gust of Aulen, *Christus Victor,* Chap. V. (New York: Macmillan, 1951). Anselm's work *Cur Deus Homo* has been one of the most influential works in the history of medieval and modern Christology.

20. Mackintosh, *op. cit.,* 230.

stitution as means of salvation. They begin with Jesus' cross and victory and the working of the Spirit within their hearts rather than with statements about deity and humanity. They know Jesus to be both true deity and true humanity and that through faith in him he overcomes sin, death, and the Devil in them.

The Reformers believe that in order to know Christ it is necessary to begin with His human life. One must begin with the recorded facts of the life of Jesus. It was not by proclaiming himself Messiah but by revealing deity in his human form that he taught men in Palestine about himself. This is the proper approach for us, as it was for the Reformers. The traditional doctrines of Nicaea and Chalcedon are repeated in the Evangelical creeds, and with the Reformers the words become not dead formulas but living realities.

Modern Theology

After the Reformation, a Protestant scholasticism developed which was more intent upon keeping the Reformers' theological formulas than their living realities. This was a departure from the Reformers' emphasis upon the personal Lord.[21] Protestant scholasticism was succeeded by the Rationalism of the eighteenth century. William Sanday says:

> This Rationalism made a clean sweep of Christology altogether. For it Christianity meant the teaching as it conceived it, and especially the moral teaching of Christ. But within these limits there was little or no room for a doctrine of His Person.[22]

One laid down the principle that Christology as a dogma was no part of the Christian faith, because that faith is what Jesus taught and not the religion of which He was made the object.

Hegel restores interest in Christology but he is not concerned with the person of Jesus but with a metaphysical

---

21. See *e.g.*, the Formula of Concord, in Schaff, *op. cit.*, III, 147-159.

22. William Sanday, *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, 59. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910).

principle to explain human history. Christology is the expression of the meeting point of Infinite and finite in which the Absolute Spirit is working itself out in history. The Hegelians, for the most part, made Christology simply an expression of the human spirit's grasping for light. However, in I. A. Dorner's massive work[23] there is a real coming of God into human life, but it might have been to one man as well as to another. This is the direction taken later by Protestant Liberalism, which lost sight of God as a person and made Christ embody in his consciousness the power of Deity. Christ thereby became our Redeemer by sharing with us a consciousness of a power above the merely human which carries us beyond ourselves to a higher realm.

II. The Biblical Foundation

The rationalistic and speculative spirit naturally produced a reaction. Thus men were driven from the two emphases upon the intellect of man and its grasp of ultimate reality to the two emphases of the whole personality of man and the involvement in the ordinary affairs of life.

Quest of the Historical Jesus

At the height of Liberalism there were emphases also to return to the historic Jesus. Schleiermacher aids Liberalism in a very great way, because he gives some warmth to Hegelianism by emphasizing religious experience rather than dogmas of the intellect.[24] But it is a feeling of dependence and not of personal encounter. He leans on a metaphysical construct and does not have personal rapport with the living Lord. Ritschl carries this anti-metaphysical side much further than Schleiermacher and says that in Christ the man, we know God as he is in himself. He has the value of God for us.[25] Thus he becomes interested not in Hegelian specula-

23. I. A. Dorner, *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, 5 Vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1861).

24. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928).

25. Albrecht Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation: The Positive Development of the Doctrine* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902).

tion but in the historic Jesus. Following Ritschl there arose a host of students who sought to find the historic Jesus and the movement was both culminated and exploded in Schweitzer's monumental work.[26] The apex of the historic Jesus school of thought was reached in Harnack's *What is Christianity?* and Herrmann's *Communion of the Christian With God.*

The leaders of form criticism have shown the weaknesses in the source criticism of the historic school, and they clearly demonstrate that a complete recovery of the "Jesus of history" is impossible. Contemporary Biblical scholars have abandoned the idea that they can completely recover the simple figure of Jesus. However, not all are by any means as extreme as Barth, who maintains that the historic Jesus conceals rather than reveals God, nor Bultmann, who maintains that knowing Jesus after the flesh is impossible and unimportant.[27] More would agree with Dodd who believes that form criticism may be used to understand the personality of Jesus.[28] While the discovery of the impossibility of a complete recovery of the historicity was being made, it was also found that one is personally related to a living personal Lord. This latter discovery is now understood to be much more important for faith than the recovery of the simple Jesus of history would have been.[29] A personal encounter with the Christ, the head of the race, is the strongest bulwark against Monophysitism and Docetism.

Jesus' Understanding of Himself — Synoptic Gospels

When one turns from the history of Christian thought to the New Testament, he finds that the two are agreed upon their primary witness to Christ as the personal Lord who

26. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London: Black, 1945). To understand Schweitzer's Christology one must also study his *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (London: Black, 1925), and *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus* (Boston: Beacon, 1948).

27. Karl Barth, *The Doctrine of the Word of God* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936). Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (New York: Scribner's, 1934).

28. C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (London: Nisbet, 1938).

29. D. M. Baillie, *God in Christ,* Chaps. I II, (New York: Scribner's, 1948).

unites God and man. Let us note this first in the synoptic Gospels when Christ is one who is to suffer as a person to bring man into personal obedience to God.[30]

The suffering and rejection of the Son of Man is clearly indicated in three sayings in Mark (8:31; 9:31; and 10:33-34; cf. Matt. 16:21; 17:22f; 20:18f; and Luke 9:22; 9:33; 18:31-33). Here Jesus tells his disciples that the Son of Man will be abused and killed and that after three days he will rise again. It now seems quite clear that these sayings are the words of Jesus himself and that they did not arise simply in the early church. Jesus actually foresaw his own suffering, which suffering was to be as the Son of Man and Messiah. He saw himself as the fulfillment of the Old Testament expectancy of the Messiah, as the suffering and triumphant servant. He would be put to death, but he would also rise again. Jesus says that he "must" suffer death and rise again. This implies that this is no mere stroke of fate, that his death is not a catastrophe, but that it is an essential part of his mission. These sayings do not explain what purpose is to be fulfilled, but he sees this as an essential part of his relationship to both God and man.

In Mark 10:45 (cf. Matt. 20:28) Jesus says that "the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many." Hastings Rashdall maintains that the idea of a ransom is a later insertion and ought not to be used of Jesus, and he regards Jesus' service as that of any other good man.[31] But in order to hold to this religious humanitarianism one is compelled to ignore the point of most of the Messianic sayings. This is a reference to Isaiah 53 when the suffering servant is to do a service for many, which they cannot do for themselves, and he will bear their sorrow, sin, and grief, and justify and deliver them. Perhaps the "ransom" came into usage from Psalm 49:7, and from

30. In the Biblical interpretation I am very greatly indebted to Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (New York: Macmillan, 1948).

31. Hastings Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, 29-36, 49-56 (London: Macmillan, 1919).

its usage in the Greek world. In the Psalm one man cannot be a ransom to redeem another, but in the Greek world a ransom was the purchase money for freeing a slave. Here is a ransomed deliverance which men could not purchase for themselves, but it is not necessarily a substitutionary idea. By his life Christ provides a way of deliverance for men. From other sayings it is clear that this is not an external and mechanical transaction, but it must be appropriated by men by their participation with Christ.

In Mark 15:34 (cf. Matt. 27:46) are recorded Jesus' words in Aramaic from the cross, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Luther and Calvin regard this as an abandonment of Jesus by the Father in order that he might endure the pains of the lost as a substitute and thus bear all the pain and grief of sins. The saying does express a feeling of desolation, abandonment, defeat, and despair, but it does not imply that God forsook him that he might be substituted for others. The suffering is not pain directly inflicted by God, but it is entering into the condition of man who is apart from God in order that man might be reconciled to God. As man Jesus suffers the alienation of God because of man's sin. He tastes the meaning of sin and death, and by perfect obedience and perfect trust in the Father he redeems man. In the flesh he tastes death and emerges triumphant in fellowship with the Father.

Johannine Understanding of Jesus

There can be no doubt as to what is the purpose of the writer of the Fourth Gospel. He does not write a biography, as neither do the other Evangelists, but he says to his readers that he selects "signs" from the life of Jesus in order that "you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in His name" (John 20:30). From the positive affirmations by this Evangelist we see some of his conceptions of Jesus. He believes that Jesus is able to control the time at which he will be put to death (John 7:30). He believes that Jesus' death is the fulfillment of Scripture (John 2:22; 19:24, 28, 36). He

believes that Jesus is God's gift and the supreme revelation of His love (John 3:16). Jesus is from God and in his death he returns to God (John 13:3). He believes in the universality of Christ's work (John 6:51f). He believes that there is a moral necessity of the death of Christ, because only by bearing the cross can man receive eternal life (John 3:14-16). By his suffering and return to the Father he sends forth the Comforter who shall bind the believers to the Father (John 14).

Of great significance is John the Baptist's reference to Jesus as the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world (John 1:29, 36). This is probably a teaching of Jesus himself, because there seems not to have been a pre-Christian use of this conception. It is likely an adaptation of Isaiah 53. The thought is of a sacrifice which is expiatory in character. By his sacrifice men are released from sin. Jesus speaks of the believer obtaining eternal life, in the sense of fellowship with Christ through participation in receiving his body and blood (John 6:51, 53-57). Those who eat his body and drink his blood shall abide in Christ and Christ will abide in them. Jesus emphasizes the sacrificial gift of his life and that by receiving and participating with him in his sacrifice the believer gains eternal life. By his sacrifice the world is judged and the prince of the world is cast out, and by his sacrifice all men will be drawn unto him (John 12:24-32).

Jesus considers himself to be the Mediator by which men are united to him and are enabled to do the Father's will and to bear his fruit. Christ is the vine, his disciples are branches, and the Father is the vinedresser. But it has personal not impersonal characteristics. It is love that is the real binding force in the union, and this love, which is from the Father, is made available by the sacrifice of Christ (John 15:1-17).

What is emphasized in John's writings is not merely the historic figure but the personal relationship of Jesus to men and the way in which he reveals God to be a compassionate, loving, and active Father coming forth to redeem his crea-

tures. Indeed, this holds for the Synoptics also. All the Gospels are written to expose the divinity behind the humanity, as this is disclosed to faith.

Paul's Understanding of Jesus

Much attention has been given to the idea of *Kenosis* in the thought of Paul. This comes from the self-emptying of the divine nature which Paul brings out in Phil. 2:7. The idea finds support from Mark 13:32 in which Jesus implies that there is a limitation upon his divinity while in this earthly life. Here he says that he is limited in knowledge. It is also supported by Luke 2:52 when it is said that Jesus grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and men. The idea has been noted throughout Christian history, but it was first developed into a Christological theory by Gottfried Thomasius in *Christ's Person and Work*, published in three parts between 1853 and 1861. The idea was then taken up by French, British, and American theologians as well as by Germans.[32] The influence of *Kenosis* is seen in Professors Godet, Fairbairn, Mackintosh, Bishop Gore, P. T. Forsyth, and other well-known theologians.

The central idea of the Kenotic theory is the affirmation that in the incarnation the second person of the Trinity, the Son of God, the divine Logos, laid aside his distinctly divine attribute and lived on earth within the limitations of humanity. This looks very promising at first sight because it escapes docetism and allows us to look upon Jesus completely as a human person. It would appear that one could then go all the way in applying human categories to Jesus; he lived, thought, worked, and felt, as a man. No doubt this is one idea held by Paul and it has some truth in it. However, it will not bear investigation as a full theory of Christology, as D. M. Baillie indicates.[33] First is the criticism of William Temple, who points out that the Son of God is essential to the order and support of the universe, and if

32. For the history of this development see Sanday, *op. cit.*, 71-78.

33. Baillie, *op. cit.*, 95-98.

he were emptied for a period the universe would have had no support. Second, the Kenotic theory advocates not true incarnation but a temporary theophany, in which divinity is temporarily dropped in order to assume humanity. Thus Christ is not God-man, but in succession he was God, then man, then God again.

Another tendency is that of treating Paul as the theologian of a Christ who satisfies the judgment of God upon sinners and provides an atonement in order that some might escape punishment. This is often understood to be the orthodox Christology and soteriology. But Anselm and not Paul is the creator of this view. It is obvious that Paul believes not in a substitutionary idea of atonement but in a participation with Christ. He emphasizes the necessity of being crucified with Christ and of presenting one's body as a sacrifice. The scriptural foundation of the substitutionary view is found in a few passages, such as Romans 3:24.[34] The widespread acceptance of this view as orthodox led Deissmann erroneously to set the religion of Jesus and the faith of Paul in contrast. His idea is that Paul made Jesus the object of faith and thus substituted a religion *about* Jesus for the religion *of* Jesus.

The center of Paul's Christology is the personal Lord who met Paul on the road to Damascus. He begins not with theological formulae but with the person. Paul's desire is to know "Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). He is interested in the risen and glorified Lord, who is the revelation of God (Gal. 1:16). By his suffering and resurrection God has highly exalted him and set him above all rule and authority and power and dominion (Eph. 1:21). The Lord is able to have dominion over those who submit to him so that Paul could say that no longer did he live but Christ lived in him (Gal. 2:20). He is the head of his community and the community becomes his body (Romans 12:5; 1 Cor. 12). Those who are in Christ are new creatures (2 Cor. 5:7). By his death he overcame the powers of darkness (Col.

34. Aulen, *op. cit.*, 62.

2:15), and his kingdom is now present (Romans 14:17). Christ is the second Adam (1 Cor. 15:45) by which humanity is restored to fellowship with the Father. Christ is the eternal Son of God, the image of the invisible God (Col. 1:15). The pre-existent Christ became man (Phil. 2:1-11). As the pre-existent Son he was the divine agent of creation (1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:15ff).

Summary and Conclusion

Christology is and must remain the center of the Christian Faith. The unique affirmation of our faith is that in Jesus Christ—he who is fully God and fully man—God has reconciled the world unto himself. All other affirmations of our Faith are meaningful and important as they are related to this central truth about Christ. Only as we are personally related to God in the living person Jesus Christ are we in the Faith. We are always tempted to allow a doctrine of a substitutionary and external atonement take the place of a personal relationship. Modern Christology seems to be quite aware of this danger and it is properly safeguarding the center of the Faith by emphasizing the necessity of the personal relationship of God and man by the God-man.

The Miraculous Conception

Part III. The Church Fathers

BY DALE MOODY

Ignatius of Antioch (?-107?)

At the beginning of the second century recognition was given to both the Holy Spirit and the virginity (*parthenia*) of Mary. Ignatius of Antioch, writing during the reign of Trajan (98-117 A.D.), says:

> For our God Jesus Christ
> was conceived by Mary according to God's plan,
> of the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit;
> Who was born and was baptized
> that by His Passion He might cleanse water.[1]

The reference to the seed of David is from Romans 1:3 in the New Testament and does not suggest a male agent participating in the conception of Jesus from Mary and from the Holy Spirit. In the next chapter Ignatius speaks of the virginity (*parthenia*) of Mary along with the birth and death of Jesus as one of the "three secrets crying to be told."[2] In this miracle "God was revealing himself as man,"[3] and this emphasis upon humanity is the central concern of Ignatius in opposition to the Docetism that denied that Jesus was born at all. This is abundantly clear in other creedal statements in the writings of Ignatius. A second passage says:

> Be deaf when anyone speaks to you part from
> Jesus Christ,
> Who was of the stock of David,
> Who was from Mary,
> Who was *truly* born, ate and drank
> Was *truly* persecuted under Pontius Pilate,
> Was *truly* crucified and died
> in the sight of beings heavenly, earthly
> and under the earth,
> Who was *truly* raised from the dead, His Father
> raising Him. . . .[4]

---

1. *Ephesians*, 18:2. Quoted from J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950), p. 68.
2. *Ephesians*, 19:1. cf. 7, 18.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Trallians*, 9:1-2. Quoted from J. N. D. Kelly, *loc. cit.* Emphasis mine.

The emphasis on the word "truly" (*alethos*) indicates the refutation of Docetism. Even when it is said Jesus was born of a *parthenos* the chief concern is that he was born. Ignatius again speaks:

> . . . being fully persuaded as regards our Lord,
> that He was *truly* of David's stock after the flesh,
> Son of God by the Divine will and power,
> begotten *truly* of the Virgin (*parthenon*),
> baptized by John that he might fulfill all righteousness, *truly* nailed in the flesh on our behalf under
> Pontius Pilate and Herod the Tetrarch . . .
> that through His resurrection He might set up an ensign . . . in one body of His Church.[5]

Justin Martyr (100?-165?)

Later in the second century Justin Martyr defended both the humanity of Jesus and the Virgin Birth. Before he suffered martyrdom sometime during the years 163-167 A. D. he waged a polemic that was threefold. His polemic against the Docetics continued the emphasis on the true humanity of Jesus found in the writings of Ignatius. The birth from the *parthenos* is repeatedly related to the fact that Jesus was a man. This can be no accident in the creedal passages.[6] The following illustrate the point:

> We find proclaimed beforehand in the books of the prophets that Jesus our Lord would come to earth,
> *be born through the Virgin and be made man . . .*[7]
> *He was conceived as a man of the Virgin . . .*[8]
> For the rest you must prove that he consented to
> *be born as a man through the Virgin . . .*[9]
> *Who was born through the Virgin, and became a passable man . . .*[10]

The second phase of Justin's polemics was against the pagans. In his *Apology*, written soon after A.D. 150, Justin adopts a dangerous *argumentum ad hominem* by the use of pagan analogies to the birth of Jesus.

5. *Smyrnaeans*, 1:1-2. Quoted from *Ibid.* Emphasis mine.
6. J. N. D. Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
7. *Apology* I, 31. Emphasis mine.
8. *Apology* I, 46. Emphasis mine.
9. *Dialogue*, 63. Emphasis mine.
10. *Dialogue*, 85. See also *Dialogue*, 100. Emphasis mine.

> And when we say also that the Word, who is the first-born of God, was produced without sexual union, and that He, Jesus Christ, our Teacher, was crucified and died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, *we propound nothing different from what you believe regarding those whom you esteem sons of Jupiter.*[11]

Of course Justin goes on to say that "wicked devils perpetrated these things,"[12] but nevertheless he reduces the birth of Jesus to the level of pagan mythology by saying "we propound nothing different." In the next chapter he again says:

> And if we assent that the Word of God was born of God in a peculiar manner, different from ordinary generation, let this, as said above, be no extraordinary thing to you, who say that Mercury is the angelic word of God. . . And if we affirm that he was born of a virgin (*parthenos*) accept this in common with what you accept of Perseus.[13]

Machen pleads for "us not to be too severe" on Justin, but he is forced to say that "there is every reason to believe that Justin Martyr has fallen into such an error."[14] With this in the background one is not greatly impressed when Justin gives *parthenos* a restricted meaning that Homer, Pindar, Sophocles, Aristophanes, the Septuagint, and the Papyri will not allow. Justin says that Isaiah 7:14 signifies that a *parthenos* should conceive without intercourse, "for if she had had intercourse with any one whatever she would no longer be a *parthenos.*"[15]

The third phase of Justin's polemic was against the Jews. About A.D. 128, (according to Epiphanius) there lived a Greek proselyte to Judaism by the name of Aquila. Jerome said he had been a pupil of Rabbi Akiba between A.D. 95 and A.D. 135. His translation of the Hebrew Old Testament in Greek is slavishly done word for word. Like

---

11. *Apology* I, 21. See also Tertullian, *Apology,* 21 (ANF). Emphasis mine.
12. *Loc. cit.*
13. *Apology,* I. 22 (ANF).
14. J. Gresham Machen, *op. cit.*, p. 336.
15. *Apology* I. 33.

the later translations of Theodotion in the reign of Commodus (A.D. 180-192) and of Symmachus in the reign of Severus (A.D. 193-211), the Hebrew *'almah* was translated *neanis*.[16] In the effort to refute this translation along with the identification of Immanuel with Hezekiah and the implications of the argument from analogy, Justin puts the following words into the mouth of Trypho:

> The Scripture has not, "Behold, the virgin (*parthenos*) shall conceive and bear a son," but, "Behold, the young woman (*neanis*) shall conceive, and bear a son," and so on as you quoted. But the whole prophecy refers to Hezekiah, and it is proved that it was fulfilled in him, according to the terms of this prophecy. Moreover, in the fables of those who are called Greeks, it is written that Perseus was begotten of Danae, who was a virgin (*parthenos*); he who was called among them Zeus, having descended on her in the form of a golden shower. And you ought to feel ashamed when you make assertions similar to theirs, and rather should say that this Jesus was born man of men. And if you prove from the Scriptures that He is the Christ, and that on account of having led a life conformed to the law, and perfect, He deserved the honour of being elected to be Christ, it is well; but do not venture to tell monstrous phenomena, lest you be convicted of talking foolishly like the Greeks.[17]

Justin argues against *neanis* by appeal to the Septuagint translation. The Septuagint translation of *parthenos* in Isaiah 7:14, along with Matthew 1:23 is not untrue if the wider use of *parthenos* is recognized, but with Justin's restricted meaning of *parthenos*[18] Trypho was forced to the translation of Aquila. The argument of Justin against Hezekiah could have been very easy had he noticed with Jerome that Hezekiah was nine years old when Isaiah 7:14 was uttered. At another point, however, Justin gets very

16. Fridericus Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum* (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1875), Vol. II, p. 443. Cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, III. 21. 1-2; Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, V. 8. 10-15.

17. *Dialogue With Trypho*, 67 (ANF). See also 43, 54, 56. The *Dialogue* was written between A. D. 155 and 160.

18. *Apology*, I. 33.

near to the theory, mentioned by Jerome, that Immanuel is Maher-shalal-hash-baz by the manner in which he quotes Isaiah 7:14-17.

> Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign; Behold, the virgin (*parthenos*) shall conceive, and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat; before he knows or prefers the evil he will choose out the good. For before the child knows how to call father or mother, he shall receive the power of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria, in the presence of the king of Assyria. And the land shall be forsaken, which thou shalt with difficulty endure in consequence of the presence of the two kings. But God shall bring on thee, and on thy people, and on the house of thy fathers, days which have not yet come upon thee since the day in which Ephraim took away from from Judah the king of Assyria.[19]

It will be noted that the child not only "shall receive the power of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria, in the presence of the king of Assyria" before he can reject evil and choose good, but that Isaiah 8:4, words describing Maher-shalal-hash-baz, have been inserted between Isaiah 7:16 and Isaiah 7:17. Justin would have real difficulty in explaining how the things in Isaiah 7:14-17 could happen in the days of the two kings if the passage has *exclusive* reference to Jesus. The typological argument can face this difficulty with success. Trypho's chiding suggestion that Justin had said "Perseus was born of a *parthenos*"[20] is blasted as being "due to imitation on the part of the deceiving Serpent."[21] Such is the retort received when the *argumentum ad hominem* used on the Greeks is turned on the Christians by a Jew. This is not impressive polemics! When Justin turns almost immediately to the charge that the Jews cut *apo Xulou* (from the wood) out of Psalm 96:10,[22] which is almost certainly not true, the Jew is not likely to feel overwhelmed by such Christian apologetics.

19. *Dialogue with Trypho,* 66 (ANF).
20. Cf. Justin, *Apology,* 1:22.
21. *Dialogue With Trypho,* 70.
22. *Ibid.,* 73.

Irenaeus of Lyon (130?-202?)

Irenaeus of Lyon (A.D. 130?-202?), the heresiologist of Gaul, wrote *Against the Heresies about* A.D. 180 and the *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching* later. He was primarily concerned with the exposure and refutation of the many forms of Gnosticism which denied the humanity of our Lord. These heretics said, "Christ passed through Mary just as water through a tube,"[23] and did not become flesh at all. Against this denial of the humanity of Jesus Irenaeus writes:

> Those, therefore who allege that He took nothing from the *Parthenos* do greatly err. . . . Superfluous, too, in that case is His descent into Mary; for why did He come down into her if He were to take nothing of her?[24]

Rejecting the translation of Isaiah 7:14 in Aquila and Theodotion, because Ebionites used it to assert that Jesus was begotten by Joseph, Irenaeus argued that the eating of "butter and honey" showed that Jesus was a man and that rejecting evil and choosing good was "proper to God."[25] He also introduced the argument from Jeremiah 32:24-28 to prove that the humanity of Jesus could not come from Joseph but from Mary.

With the refutation of heresies Irenaeus also joined the Virgin Birth to his famous theory of recapitulation. This is summed up by his ideas of the second Adam and the second Eve. Using the restricted meaning of *parthenos,* he introduced the analogy that, since the first Adam was made without a father from "untilled and as yet virgin soil," the second Adam, to make a recapitulation in Himself to reverse the disobedience of the first Adam, rightly received a birth from a virgin.[26] The analogy of the second Adam leads on to the analogy of the second Eve. Since sin entered the world through the disobedience of a virgin, for procreation of

23. *Against the Heresies,* I. 7.2 (ANF).
24. *Ibid.,* III. 22.1, 2.
25. *Ibid.,* III. 21.4 (ANF).
26. *Against the Heresies* III. 21. 10 (ANF). See also III. 18. 7 and *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching,* 32.

children had not taken place, in like manner a virgin, by yielding obedience (Luke 1:38), became "the cause of salvation, both to herself and the whole human race."[27] Again he says:

> And thus also it was that the knot of Eve's disobedience was loosed by the obedience of Mary. For what the virgin Eve had bound fast through unbelief, this did the virgin Mary set free through faith.[28]

The first Eve was led astray by an angel, but the second Eve heard the glad news and was obedient to God's word.

> And if the former did disobey God, yet the latter was persuaded to be obedient to God, in order that the Virgin Mary might become the patroness (*advocata*) of the virgin Eve. And thus as the human race fell into bondage to death by means of a virgin, so it is rescued by a virgin; virginal disobedience having been balanced in the opposite scale by virginal obedience.[29]

Therefore, the Son of God is "the pure One opening purely that pure womb which regenerates men to God, and which He Himself made pure."[30] It is not difficult to see in Irenaeus the seeds of Roman Catholic Mariology, but his primary concern was the true Incarnation of the Son of God in human flesh and the reversal of the process of sin by recapitulation. His attention turns toward the place of the Holy Spirit in the Incarnation when he faces the Ebionite assertion that Jesus was begotten by Joseph. He speaks of the Ebionites as those:

> Who do not choose to understand that the Holy Spirit came upon Mary, and the power of the Most High did overshadow her: Wherefore also what was generated is a holy thing, and the Son of the Most High the Father of all, who effected the incarnation of this being, and showed forth a new kind of re-

---

27. *Against the Heresies,* III. 22.4 (ANF).
28. *Loc. cit.* (ANF).
29. *Against the Heresies,* V. 19:1 (ANF). See also *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching,* 33.
30. *Against the Heresies,* IV. 33. 11 (ANF).

> generation . . . that as by the former generation we inherited death, so by the new generation we might inherit life.[31]

This, however, was an emphasis of the future.

Origen (185?-254?)

About A.D. 177-180 a certain Celsus wrote *The True Doctrine,* a violent attack on many Christian beliefs. He put into the mouth of a Jew that Jesus was "produced by the adultery of Panthera and a *parthenos.*"[32] Professor Adolf Deissmann has demonstrated that the name Panthera was common at this period, especially among Roman Soldiers; and from this fact L. Patterson has drawn a plausible explanation of the origin of the legend.

> Some Jewish controversialist seized on the name, perhaps because of its similarity to the word *parthenos.* Then the legend of the Roman Soldier grew up and found its way into the Talmud with the purpose of discrediting and vilifying the Christian tradition as soon as the gospel story became known to the general public.[33]

The challenge of Celsus was so serious that Origen (A.D. 185-254?) was called upon to answer him in *Contra Celsum* written about A.D. 248. Origen states the problem of the birth of Jesus as follows:

> Let us return, however, to the words put into the mouth of the Jew, where the mother of Jesus is described as having been turned out by the carpenter who was betrothed to her, as she had been convicted of adultery and had a child by a certain soldier named Panthera. Let us consider whether those

---

31. *Against the Heresies,* V. 1. 3 (ANF).

32. Origen, *Contra Celsum,* 1. 32, 33. All quotations from the *Contra Celsum* are based on Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953).

33. L. Patterson, "Origin of the Name Panthera," *The Journal of Theological Studies,* XIX (1917), p. 80. The references supplied by Patterson may be supplemented by a learned note in Henry Chadwick, *op. cit.,* p. 31, n. 3. The fantastic concession by Nels F. S. Ferre, *The Christian Understanding of God* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1951), p. 191, revives this legend in Nazi dress.

> who fabricated the myth that the *parthenos* and Panthera committed adultery and that the carpenter turned her out, were not blind when they concocted all this to get rid of the miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit.[34]

Origen does not develop the idea of "the miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit," a phrase he seems to use as a synonym for "miraculous birth," but turns to a series of shaky arguments. He first develops an argument from Platonism. Assuming the grounds of Platonism, which taught that the nobility of the soul determined the nature of the body, Origen raises the question as to whether there should "not be a certain soul that takes a body which is entirely miraculous, which has something in common with men in order to be able to live with them, but which also has something out of the ordinary in order that the soul may remain uncontaminated by sin."[35] The argument has no weight if one argues on Biblical grounds which knows nothing of Plato's doctrine of metempsychosis. The Son of God did exist before he came to dwell in a sinless body, but this belief is not based on any idea of the transmigration of the soul.

Origen then turns to the argument from Isaiah 7:14, but the editor of the Hexapla which contained the translations of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, is acutely aware of the weakness of any argument from *'almah*. He first makes the statement that *'almah* appears in Deuteronomy 22:23-26, but the Masoretic text does not support him in this claim.[36] He then turns from the argument from *'almah* lest he "appear to depend on a Hebrew word."[37] An error and an apology do not make strong argument!

Origen next turns to the *sign* argument, but we have already pointed out the weakness of this argument. Making

---

34. *Contra Celsum*, I. 32.
35. *Ibid.* I. 33.
36. *Ibid.* I. 34. See also Basil the Great in *Hom. sanctam chr. gener.* 4.
37. *Ibid.* I. 35.

no effort to refute the claim that the sign was for the time of Ahaz, he turns to the phase "in the depth or in the height" to find them fulfilled in Ephesians 4:10; but Ephesians 4:10 has to do with the descent and ascent of Christ at his resurrection.

The final argument of Origen is the dangerous argument from analogy. After a statement about predictive prophecy, which this essay does not deny, two analogies are mentioned. The first analogy is vultures. He says:

> Among the animals there are certain females that have no intercourse with the male, as writers on animals say of vultures; this creature preserves the continuation of the species without any copulation. Why, therefore, is it incredible that if God wished to send some divine teacher to mankind He should have made the organism of him that was to be born come into being in a different way instead of using the generative principle derived from sexual intercourse of men and women.[38]

The second analogy is the Greek myth about Plato. Origen did not believe the tale which said "when Plato was born of Amphictione Ariston was prevented from having sexual intercourse with her until she had brought forth the child she had by Apollo," but he thought it "not out of place" in addressing Greeks lest Christians "appear to be the only people to have related this incredible story."[39] This to be sure, like the arguments of Justin, is *argumentum ad hominem*, but it is hardly adequate for those who, like the writer, believe the conception and birth of Jesus have no analogy! "The miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit," which Origen failed to develop, could be used to great advantage by one putting forth such arguments as *Contra Celsum* employs.

Jerome (340?-420)

At some future time the present writer hopes to explore the mythological, monastic, and modern origins of Roman Catholic Mariology. Those who think they find support in

38. *Ibid.* I. 37. cf. Rufinus, *Expositio in Symbolum,* 11.
39. *Loc. cit.*

supposed parallels to the birth of our Lord in Ugaritic and Hellenistic mythology fall into the same error as did the Partristic theology which finally displaced the mythological mother figure with Mary. This approach of mythological analogy combined with an unhebraic idea of virginity led to the Roman Catholic dogma of Mary's perpetual virginity and the whole mythological system of Mariology that will not end, even with the ideas of Mary's immaculate conception (1854) and bodily assumption (1950), until Mary is blasphemously proclaimed co-redeemer with Christ. Irenaeus came very close to the idea of Mary as a co-redeemer, but it was Jerome, more than any other person in Patristic times, that prepared the way for modern Marianism. His major arguments are found in his defense of perpetual virginity and his attack on a true parturition. The defense of perpetual virginity is fully stated in the writing against Helvidius in A.D. 383. Tertullian made reference to the marriage of Joseph and Mary and the brothers of Jesus as proofs of the humanity of our Lord.[40] This emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus, however, excluded Joseph as the agent of Mary's conception.[41] When Helvidius took up the argument about the brothers of Jesus in his criticisms of current views on virginity (about A.D. 380) Jerome violently resisted him with a dogmatic defense of the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary. Piously he proclaimed:

> I must entreat God the Father to show that the mother of His Son, who was a mother before she was a bride continued to be a virgin after her son was born.[42]

This defense of perpetual virginity led to an attack on a true parturition when Jesus was born.

In the second century the apocryphal *Book of James,* or

---

40. *De monogamia,* VIII; *De carne Christi,* VII; *Adversus Marcionem,* IV. 19.

41. *Adversus Valentinum,* XXVII; *Adversus Praxeam,* 1; *De carne Christi,* V, XVI, XVII, XX, XXI; XXIII; *Adversus Judaeos,* IX, XIII; *Adversus Marcionem,* III. 12, 20; IV. 2, 10, 36; *Ad Nationes* II. 3; *Apologia,* XXI.

42. *Against Helvidius,* 2.

Protoevangelium,[43] described the obstetrical details that supported the belief that the womb of Mary was opened neither in the conception nor in the birth of Jesus. Clement of Alexandria mentions the idea with approval but admits that it was unknown to the majority.[44] When this idea was challenged by Jovinianus he was condemned for heresy at Rome and at Milan in A.D. 390. Jerome argued that Jesus passed through the wall of Mary's womb as he passed through the wall of Joseph's tomb—neither was opened.[45] Even Augustine accepted this view,[46] yet it seems clearly in opposition to the true humanity of Jesus defended by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hilary. How could the infant Jesus be truly human and pass through the wall of Mary's womb at birth as he passed through the wall of Joseph's tomb after he was raised from the dead? The analogy does not follow, and the argument that denies true parturition is Docetic and Gnostic theology.

The Apostles' Creed

It is necessary to bring this brief discussion to a close with a few statements on the Christological importance of the Holy Spirit in the Old Roman Creed and the Textus Receptus of the Apostles' Creed. The old idea that the Apostles' Creed was composed by the Apostles in Jerusalem is now recognized as a legend. It is generally agreed today that the Old Roman Creed assumed the form found in the creeds of Marcellus of Ancyra (A.D. 340) and Rufinus of Aquileia (A.D. 400) about the middle of the second century, although Kattenbusch and Zahn would date it much earlier.[47] The chief reason for the plausibility of the second half of the second century is the prevalence of a Spirit-Christology.[48]

---

43. IX. 2; XIX. 1.
44. *Stromateis,* VII, 93.
45. *Against Jovinianus,* I. 31; *To Pammachius* (Letter XLVIII), 21.
46. *Enchiridion,* 34; *The City of God,* XXII. 8; *Letter 137.*
47. J. Gresham Machen, *op. cit.,* p. 5; J. N. D. Kelly, *op. cit.,* p. 147.
48. J. N. D. Kelly, *op. cit.,* pp. 146-149, introduces the problems with important documentation.

The Greek creed of Marcellus and the Latin creed of Rufinus read: "born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary" (*gennethenta ek pneumatos hagion kai Marias tes parthenou; natus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria virgine*). These clearly employ the *ek pneumatos hagiou* of Matthew 1:18 (cf. 1:20). Rufinus' *Expositio in Symbolum*, in which the Latin form of the Old Roman Creed is found, distinguishes the *conception* and the *birth* in the commentary (9-13), but there is abundant evidence that the original formulation in the second century was stimulated by the Spirit-Christology which declared the Spirit became incarnate when the Word became flesh.

The important modification and clarification which distinguishes *conceptus* and *natus* appears in a sermon by Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, A.D. 503-543, and it would seem that Gaul is the place where previous development took place. Two facts substantiate this suggestion. The first is the theology of Hilary of Poitiers (A.D. 315-367), "the Athanasius of the West." Hilary repeatedly gives emphasis to the fact that the function of the Holy Spirit was to conceive, as deity and humanity were united. Speaking of I Cor. 15:47 Hilary says:

> Calling Him "Man" he expresses His birth from the Virgin, who in the exercise of her office as mother, performed the duties of her sex in the conception and birth of a man. And when he says, *The second man from heaven* he testifies His origin from the Holy Spirit, Who came upon the Virgin. As He is then man, and from heaven, this man was born of the Virgin, and conceived of the Holy Spirit.[49]

With uncommon insight Hilary rejects all views that undermine the true humanity of our lord which he received from the Virgin Mary.

> The body was truly and indeed body, because it was born of the Virgin: but it was above the weakness of our body, because it had its beginning in spiritual conception.[50]

---

49. *De trinitate*, X. 17 (NPNF).
50. *Ibid.*, X. 35.

It is this "spiritual conception" where the miracle of the Incarnation took place that this essay seeks to magnify. No Protestant denies when pressed that it is the *conception* and not the *birth* that marks the point where the supernatural breaks into the natural process. Why then do apologists hesitate to focus attention on the moment of the miracle? A physician would have seen nothing unusual about the *birth* of Jesus, but he would have no scientific explanation whatsoever about the *conception.* It is a supernatural event for which there is no natural explanation. We may designate the miracle, but we are unable to dissolve it. It should be said that Machen saw clearly this crucial point, using the term "supernatural conception" more than a dozen times in Chapter VI alone, but there is a type of journalistic theology, far removed from Machen's insight, that seems willing to stand or fall on the mere use of the word *parthenos* with emphasis on the birth alone. In our judgment this is insufficient to commend the miracle of Incarnation in our time. Such terms as "spiritual conception" (Hilary) and "supernatural conception" (Machen) along with "miraculous conception" are far more exact. To be sure any term can be redefined, as Schleiermacher's use of "supernatural conception" and Nels Ferre's use of "Virgin Birth" would indicate, but there should be no doubt that the present writer seeks to use the term "miraculous conception" to designate a miracle in the womb of a pure and spotless *parthenos* by the sole agency of the Holy Spirit.

The second fact that points to Gaul as the source of the distinction between *conceptus* and *natus* is the creed of a group of orthodox bishops meeting in A.D. 359 at Ariminium.[51] The creed containing the words *"conceptus est de Spiritu sancto, natus ex Maria virgine"* was perhaps the work of Phoebadius of Agen in Gaul. It is not difficult to see the influence of Hilary's *De trinitate* written two years before, and these two facts seem to stand behind the Gallican creed of Caesarius of Arles. In A.D. 367, the year of Hilary's death, Athanasius of Alexandria wrote his famous Paschal

51. Jerome, *Dialogus adversus Luciferianos,* 17.

Letter which gave the first listing of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament canon:[52] With the Creed and the Canon an important point was reached.

When the curtain rises on this problem in the nineteenth century Schleiermacher, the father of modernism, is attacking the conservative Gerhard for depending on Hilary's "ingenious explanations as to why this activity is attributed specially to the Holy Spirit."[53] It is here the modern battle began, and a critical reading of Schleiermacher, Barth, Brunner, and Nels Ferre will reveal that here the battle should continue.

---

52. Anthanasius, *Letter* XXXIX. 5.
53. F. D. E. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, trans. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928), p. 406.

When Religion and Psychotherapy Meet

BY R. LOFTON HUDSON

Religion and psychotherapy not only meet but they sometimes overlap. Not infrequently they are at odds. In time to come they may hope to collaborate and cooperate. Each may teach the other. In fact, collaboration in helping individuals is already working in many quarters. And as each is recognizing the value of better understanding and of working hand-in-hand, both are preventing mental illness and are helping sick people to get well. This has been termed the "total push" toward health that can be effected by such teamwork.

The meeting, and even overlapping, of these two great human endeavors is inevitable. Both claim to deal with the whole person. Religion cannot be relegated to a Sunday exercise, to ethics and worship, nor even to dealing with spiritual matters. It concerns itself with economics, with health, with recreation, with interpersonal relations, and with government. Likewise psychiatry claims to take a holistic approach. It is concerned with "the organism as a whole." We exist, they rightly claim, not as Robinson Crusoes, but as individuals in a global environment. This view of the whole person in all of his contexts naturally involves the spiritual or mystical as well as the physical and the mundane. To ask the psychotherapist to stay out of the field of religion and ethics is to ask him to deny one of his basic viewpoints. This, in the interest of humanity, would hardly be appropriate, if it were possible.

The pastor and the psychotherapist meet also in the care of a particular patient. One study shows that forty per cent of the mentally ill turn to a minister first for help. Many of these need psychiatric help.

A minister is in a peculiarly fortunate position to interpret to the sick person his need for psychotherapy. He trusts the minister. Religion proposes to help people who have inner and/or social problems. The salvation of the soul means in the mind of many people the alleviating of such crippling conditions as excessive fears, worry, moral

failure, wrong attitudes, and even sexual deviations. It is only natural, and desirable, that the church should be the refuge for people when they get caught in such storms.

Religion does not adequately meet all of these needs, however. This admission may be a bitter pill for some churchmen to swallow, but it is true. A few years in a pastorate will prove this to any minister. This does not mean that Christ is not what He professes to be—sufficient for every need. The Christian who speaks of the sufficiency of Christ is referring to every spiritual need, else his statement is false. Religion does not claim to remove astigmatism, scabies, polio, mumps or a coronary occlusion. Why should it claim to be sufficient for unreasoning depression, schizophrenia, psychopathic personalities, or homosexuality? This is not to imply that religion has nothing to offer these people. It has. To the contrary, it accents the need for psychiatry and religion to join hands.

For example, in a certain city in Oklahoma a depressed young woman came to a pastor's study and talked with the minister. Three hours later she leaped to her death from the window of a downtown building. The pastor announced the next Sunday that he was planning to employ a full time psychiatrist as a member of the staff. Whether he carried through on his plan, one does not know, nor can he even be sure that this is advisable. That pastor might more wisely learn to collaborate with local psychiatrists. If his own training had been adequate he might have even prevented the suicide himself. What one can be sure of is that this person needed both the minister and the medically trained man to help her back to health. And there are many such people. Both the psychotic and the neurotic, particularly the prepsychotic, often need the aid of both the psychotherapist and the pastor.

For example, a young religious leader, making a good salary as a church staff member, was referred by the author to a private psychiatrist. Recently his wife had left him, taking with her their six-months-old baby. This young man, the son of a minister, had shown paranoid symptoms

for several years. He moved from school to school and pursued one wild scheme after another for making money. His lack of realism, his hostility, his extreme suspicion, his ideas of grandeur and his extreme anxiety, all marked him as a man who would soon end in complete failure.

He came to the first interview on the pretense that he wanted help with a "case" with which he was dealing in his church—he quickly and apologetically admitted that it was himself. After the second interview his wife returned to him without any advice from the author. After the third interview he was able to enter *enthusiastically* and cooperatively into a referral to a psychiatrist. The author wrote the doctor, after talking to him over the phone, and gave him what was known of the history of the young man. The offer was made to have subsequent interviews with the young man if they were needed as encouragement or for dealing with any religious concerns which should be brought up.

The relation between psychotherapy and religion, however, goes deeper than the cooperation of the doctor and the minister. Some fundamental problems relate to the basic concepts of both disciplines. Two basic books have been written upon this relationship which every pastor and every psychotherapist ought to read. They are:

David C. Roberts, *Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950—$3.00).

Albert C. Outler, *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message* (Harper and Brothers, 1954—$3.50).

The clinical experience of the author in a pastoral setting and some knowledge of the competent work of these theologians provide the basis for the following observations of the meeting places of religion and psychotherapy.

I. Generally speaking religion and science both have their respective views of human nature.

Science tends to see man as solely the product of his heredity and environment. To be able to explain every cause by some effect, in other words to assume a determin-

istic outlook, is necessary to exact sciences. The most that can be said then of psychology is that it is largely scientific, or that it is an attempted science. If freedom of any sort is to be allowed as a part of reality, then cause and effect is necessarily limited. This is one of the unsolved philosophical problems of science.

In psychotherapy this has several aspects. What is man by nature? How much freedom does he possess? What are his main motivations? What hope is there for him? And what are the reliable means of helping man to his maximum maturity in this life? Does he need the help of God, assuming that there is such a being? And are we to look upon religion at its best as a necessary part of reality? Or is reality merely a "healing fiction"?

These questions are too diverse and too philosophical to be dealt with here. The psychotherapist with positivistic or humanistic assumptions will operate, consciously or unconsciously, from these viewpoints. In all humility the religious leaders must allow the scientist the right to hold to whatever faith he chooses. He can, however, and ought to challenge the humanist's views as being inadequate, unrealistic, and unproductive of the highest good of man.

The Christian sees man as created in the image of God, as a potential child of God, as experiencing excessive anxiety because he is not properly related to God. While accepting man as a body, the pastor will always be viewing man as a creature of infinite (a vague term, admittedly) possibilities, of eternal duration, and as being moved or motivated by the Spirit of God as well as by deep spiritual resources which the humanist may deny.

This is not merely an academic question. A Christian therapist may be able to say to an individual: "There is absolutely no hope for you to overcome self-worship, playing God, except through a love-faith relationship with God through Jesus Christ. You may swap one form of self-worship for another, but your real growth as God intended it is only through coming to grips with the autonomous self and with sin by the grace of God." This is a part of

therapy, and a few psychiatrists are at work translating religious concepts into significant healing terms.

It is evident that the assumptions of the therapist cannot but be significant in some cases. When one such patient brought up some religious material, the psychiatrist asserted with a good deal of conviction, "So far as I am concerned religion is just a lot of stuff to make you feel high and mighty." This is an exceptional case, and to me a rare one. But the assumption that the religion of this patient is "nothing but" a group of illusions, though socially created and accepted illusions, is evident. His concept of human nature and of ultimate reality stick out like a sore thumb.

II. Religion and psychotherapy cannot help but meet in the area of the goals of therapy—or the aims and purposes of life.

The late Dr. Karen Horney says that the broad aims of psychoanalytic therapy "include change from compulsiveness to freedom and self-direction, from inertia to spontaneity, from indiscriminate hostility to active and discriminate friendship, from self-neglect to interest in self-development, and from a sense of isolation to a real independence and joy in living and working with others."[1]

The Christian, however, would like to ask the psychologist some important questions. What is the director of this freedom and spontaneity? How does man know where to direct himself? And to whom is this indiscriminate friendship to be directed? Likewise, hostility? Is the individual to understand that he needs no guidance but his own reason and the social mores in expressing friendship or hostility? Does he need no power but his own inner resources in overcoming hate? And how can wounds caused by self-neglect be healed except by someone who can give unconditional love? (And who can do that, except God?)

1. Karen Horney, "Aims of Psychoanalytic Therapy." Condensed from *Our Inner Conflict* (W. W. Norton & Co. 1945). Condensation by Valer Barbu, M. D. for A.C.A.A.P., 226 W. End Ave., N. Y. 23, N. Y. (1945) p. 1.

Furthermore, is "real independence" what man seeks? Or is it interdependence?

Dr. Eward Glover of London has defined normal as meaning: (1) free from symptoms; (2) unhampered by mental conflict; (3) having a satisfactory working capacity; (4) being able to love someone other than himself.[2]

The religionist must say to these, "So far so good, but these criteria do not go far enough." The aim of therapy, as well as of all learning, must not stop short of "self-direction under God." If the individual does not remove the blockings that lead him from God, from the humility that acceptance of the will of God as he has made himself known, he may not be sick but he is not normal in a Christian sense, nor mature.

This may be illustrated by the homely, graphic wording of a Negro friend of mine. He said, "Religion and science are like a chicken and a duck. They both go down the road together until they come to a stream of water. The chicken must stop. That is as far as he can go. But the duck swims right across and keeps going." Religion believes in the possibilities of man, the individual man, to keep on going. It is more helpful than humanism. By faith, religious approaches to human need are a challenge to the adjustment theories of psychologists.

If the psychologist counters that the situation with sick people is too critical to quibble over ultimates, that he is trying to get the person strong enough to hold a job or to live with his wife, we can understand his viewpoint. But we must insist that to imply that the individual is incapable of this finding of God's will is a stark kind of pessimism and the opposite of faith. Furthermore, it is misleading to get a person half-well and not tell him that his situation is such. We may even go so far as to say that psychotherapy which leads a person to accept himself as he is, from the Christian viewpoint, is malpractice. One must hasten to

---

2. Edward Weiss and O. S. English, *Psychosomatic Medicine* (Saunder, 1943), p. 27.

reiterate, *from the Christian viewpoint.* Humility about our viewpoint continues respect for those who differ.

III. A critical point at which religion and psychotherapy meet is in matters pertaining to conscience.

Psychotherapists focus their attention on the intrapsychic conflict within the personality between the id, the super-ego, and the ego. They also give much attention to interpersonal relations and their effect upon the health or illness of the individual.

It seems that religion should be grateful for the light that psychology has thrown on personality. The concepts of repression, of defense mechanisms, of the nature of illness, of emotional growth, do not conflict with Christian theology. Rather, they throw some light upon it. But at the point of the function of the conscience and its transformation in therapy, there seems to be a good deal of overlapping, if not conflict with religion. When psychotherapists set themselves to the task of "the modification of the super-ego," the religious leader rightly lifts an eyebrow.

Religion has often been found guilty of sponsoring false views of conscience. "Let your conscience be your guide" is far too simple. It is not a safe guide. Both religion and science know that. But as to the alternative of accepting the mores or the ideal and standards "that seem best," religion must look askance. Only religion can reform religion, although it may gratefully acknowledge some aid and self-punishment, and it rejects hypocrisy—all growing out of distorted religion. But it cannot accept self-affirmation that knows no god but the group mind or the pagan premises of philosophical ethics.

As I have heard Dr. Karl Menninger say, "Religion aims primarily at the ego." R. S. Lee has made plain in his *Freud and Christianity* that the religion of Jesus was "Ego-religion." "It is desirable," he says, "that the Super-ego should be educable to new standards."[3] But it is precisely at this

3. R. S. Lee, *Freud and Christianity* (N.Y.: A.A. Wyn, Inc., 1949) p. 159.

point of deciding what these new standards are that religion and psychotherapy may differ. Furthermore, the Christian conscience needs the transforming and renewing power of the Holy Spirit. Ethics is not enough. Anything short of the leadership of God's Spirit is sin.

Religion rejects with psychotherapy the unproductive ways of dealing with the super-ego, such as "compliance, bribery, sacrifice, atonement, and deception."[4] But it also rejects the view that conscience is "nothing but" the accretions of internalized social ideals.

The crux of these conscience problems are met in the therapeutic session. When such matters as adultery, divorce, the drinking of alcoholic beverages, gambling, and even the matter of church attendance, are dealt with by the psychotherapist, the minister fears that the psychiatrist will de-philosophize the patient. It has been done. It is almost impossible to keep from teaching ethics in a therapeutic session. Even to be silent has meaning to the patient. Many psychotherapists aim at getting the patient comfortable. Integration on a low level is not good therapy from a Christian viewpoint. As T. S. Eliot has said, "Your business is not to clear your conscience but to learn to bear the burden on your conscience."

There are times, as every psychotherapist knows, when severe consciences must be softened. As Fenichel says, "Where super-ego was, there shall ego be."[5] But the ego must be educated. The Christian believes that this can be done only by the revelation of God.

IV. The very process of therapy is a problem for both psychotherapy and religion.

Religion has been, as someone has put it, "the psychiatry of the masses" for a long time. It must be admitted that it has not always been a good psychiatry, nor an adequate cure of souls. As Outler has said, "One looks in vain among

4. Karl A. Menninger, "The Functions of the Ego" (an unpublished paper), p. 53.

5. Otto Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* (N.Y.: W. W. Norton & Co.).

the standard books for knowledgeable recognition of the Christian message as a fruitful perspective for psychotherapeutic theory and practice."[6] Too often we have dismissed our counselees with a verse of Scripture and a prayer. We have been guilty of leaving men half-cured—like the blind man in the Gospels who said, "I see men as trees walking"[7] —before they see "every man clearly." It is this fact that has necessitated so much psychotherapy.

But, likewise, psychiatry has generally overlooked the value of religious conversions, of worship, of forgiveness, and repentance and faith. If substitute adjustments are found, the patient may be insulated against the religious experiences which might transform his life. A member of Alcoholics Anonymous said recently, "Why is it that our members who have been to a psychiatrist never seem to get anywhere in A.A.?" My reply was that it is the kind of psychotherapy which they have received.

For example, the approach of psychotherapy emphasizes "permissiveness" and a "non-judgmental" attitude on the part of the therapist. One can hardly doubt the value of these attitudes at certain stages in therapy and with certain patients. But this matter can be carried too far. It may lead to sloth and to a kind of self-acceptance which is sin. The individual, instead of growing, may become fixated on a lower level of attainment. The Christian challenge is necessarily high; to adjust to anything less than the will of God would seem to the Christian to be wrong and sinful. To forgive oneself when one needs to seek divine forgiveness may satisfy the need for a kind of self-acceptance, but there is something better in life for the human being.

Another area of meeting of religion and psychotherapy is in the actual care of the individual during the period of recovery. Doctors are often afraid for the pastor to see the patient during a hospitalization lest he (the patient) become disturbed and fail to progress. This situation grows out of the inadequate training of the minister on the one

6. *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message*, p. 20.
7. Mark 8:22-26.

hand, and out of the lack of religious orientation on the other. Fortunately both of these conditions are changing.

The greatest future in the field of counseling seems to be in the collaboration between the psychiatrist and the pastor—in many cases, between the practicing physician and the minister. More thoroughly Christian psychotherapists are needed, but teamwork between the psychiatrist and the minister is needed even more. The average pastor is not equipped to do psychotherapy. Nor does he have the time. But the pastor is in a unique position to interpret to the individual the process of psychotherapy and to support the patient in his building a good relationship with the therapist.

The therapist in turn must play fair with the pastor in not violating the religious value during the therapy process. Also, cross referrals are in order, and are increasing where pastors are trained to deal with people who become emotionally disturbed. Dr. William Menninger has said, "The pastor should be able to render psychiatric 'first aid.' Cross referral (more for the psychiatrist to refer to the pastor) is desirable."[8] Before this can be accomplished the minister must be trained in the fundamentals of diagnosis so that he will recognize the type of difficulty with which he is dealing and its seriousness. He must learn something of personality dynamics and the general principles of counseling.

Ministers have labored too long (if the welfare of the sick individual is our primary concern) under what Seward Hiltner has called "thereapeutic imperialism." Because of the very nature of mental illness, the psychiatrist must usually be in charge of the case. Most ministers wish this. But the psychiatrist sometimes shuts the minister out entirely and acts as if he had no ministry to the patient. Some ministers seem to feel that religion should be able to solve all of a person's emotional problems. They appear convinced that it is a sign of the weakness of religion itself if the parishioner has to turn to a psychiatrist for help. They

8. *Psychiatry, Its Evolution and Present Status* (N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1948), p. 45.

may even fear that the therapist will undermine the parishioner's religion faith. Surely religious faith is not that insecure.

In conclusion let me say that the meeting of psychotherapy and religion is inevitable for the following reasons:

1. Both are dealing with the same person.
2. Both are concerned with the behavior of individuals.
3. Both believe in the inwardness of human problems.
4. Both aim at a similarly, successful way of life.
5. Both believe that something can be done about the unhappiness and perversity of human beings.
6. Both seek to prevent illness and failure among us.
7. Both claim to be interested in the whole person and cannot be satisfied with an atomistic or compartmentized approach.

Great progress has been made in this century in helping a few individuals to be well and mature. As these two significant approaches to life understand each other better and join hands, the benefits of each may be available to all.

Specialized Seminary Training for the Rural Minister

By CARL A. CLARK

There is a trend in the theological field in America toward offering Seminary students an opportunity to specialize in an area of preparation for ministering to the rural churches of our nation. This movement, begun many years ago, has received considerable attention from a number of denominations. Perhaps the Catholics were the first to inaugurate such a program, as they were the first to initiate a long-range rural church objective for their membership. Protestant denominations, however, have been quick to follow suit. It is understood that every Methodist theological seminary in America now has a Department of Rural Church, offering specialized training to its students. Presbyterians, Disciples, Lutherans, and Episcopalians are not far behind. The movement began among Southern Baptist theological institutions in 1953 when Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina, called to its faculty Rev. Garland Hendricks, a very successful rural pastor and teacher, to begin a program of work in this direction. In 1954 Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary called the writer from a rural mission project in Arkansas and asked him to combine teaching and field work with the students, majoring on rural church activities. Perhaps before this is in print others of our Southern Baptist seminaries will have comparable programs.

The question which arises in our mind is: Why should there be a specialized training offered by our institutions and why should there be an increasing interest on the part of ministerial students preparing for a special area of service in the rural church?

In attempting to discuss this question, it would be well for us to consider first the needs of the rural church for a distinctively trained leadership.

Rural people have been different from urban people in their psychological attitudes and sociological interactions

since the development of a distinctive city type of life. It may be these differences are becoming less with the tremendous migration from rural to urban areas and with a progressive urbanization of rural life. Nevertheless, for the present and for the foreseeable future, there remain some distinctive characteristics of rural people which necessitate a distinctive type leadership.

A pastor must speak the language of the people to whom he preaches. If he is to pastor rural people, he must know and understand their peculiarly rural traits and be able to fit in with and understand even their secular concerns, else he will not be able to present his gospel message in the terms of their needs. If a pastor does not do this, he may as well be speaking in the Spanish language to a people who understand only English. This factor necessitates leadership skills of a specialized nature.

Another factor is the fact that rural people are developing an increasingly higher level of educational and cultural life and therefore are expecting and even in some cases, demanding, a better trained leadership. The more progress that is made in every area of life by rural people, the more necessary it will be for them to have leadership especially trained for those levels. Rural churches in the Southern Baptist Convention are growing today as never before. This development of local church programs adds to the urgency for better leadership.

There has been a phenomenal increase in the last twelve to fifteen years in the number of part-time rural churches which are moving to full-time preaching. It has been estimated that more than 5,000 rural part-time churches have increased to full-time preaching within the past seven years. This rate of growth of the churches has been requiring almost a thousand new preachers per year giving themselves to full-time rural service. This demand on the pool of trained ministers will mean either that the churches must take a more inadequately trained pastor or else our denomination must produce an increasingly larger number of well-trained men. There is no question regarding the number of men who have graduated from our seminaries or those

who are now attending. Each seminary has the largest enrollment in history. However, the obvious need is that a larger percentage of our seminary graduates should go into the rural field. With approximately 5,000 city churches in the Southern Baptist Convention, and with now over 13,000 rural churches with full-time preaching, the more men we train the more must enter the rural pastorate.

Another element requiring a new evaluation of a specialized rural training is the remarkable development of complexities in the area of rural life. Rural people of a generation ago were considered to be simple-minded, humble folk. They may still be humble, but the simple-minded have already made a failure of farming. Agriculture is becoming an exceedingly complicated industry with an increasing number of governmental agencies dealing in agricultural efforts; with increasing governmental regulations controlling or at least directing agricultural activities; with a multiplicity of independent rural organizations being developed; with ever-enlarging number of cooperatives entering into the picture; with consolidation of schools, good roads and automobiles enlarging social horizons; expanding markets involving international trade; and mechanization of almost every crop produced on farms; farm people are becoming increasingly sophisticated. Such complexity means that the man who preaches in their pulpit and who visits in their homes must have a wider understanding of all areas of these farm complications, else he cannot know how to speak their language. The gospel of Jesus Christ is the same for all of time, yet must be interpreted to every generation in its own terms and in the light of its own needs. No man can rightly relate rural people to the eternal gospel of redemption in Christ Jesus who is not able and willing to re-apply this gospel to the eminent needs of his particular day and his particular generation.

These factors mean that we as a denomination, as pastors, and as local rural churches, need to restudy our objectives of theological training in the direction of attempting to offer some measure of specialization for such a specialized

task. Basic in these objectives must be an effort to enable rural pastors to make this adjustment. It used to be that the majority of our ministerial volunteers came out of rural life and therefore having grown up in a rural environment and having had a native understanding of rural ways and thought could go back to those churches with perfect adaptation. The phenomenon that has us alerted now is that an ever larger proportion of our ministerial students are coming out of city churches. The young man who is reared in the city and goes to a rural pastorate without some orientation into the folkways and mores of their culture and into the intricasies of the modern agricultural revolution finds himself at serious loss in making the adjustment and finds the people seriously suspicious of his methods and techniques. Rural people have a right to expect a pastor who understands them and who will undergird them for the trying problems of their every day lives. Our seminaries must increasingly seek out men who can and will orient themselves into the modern agricultural picture. The more men of this type our seminaries can produce the more rural chuches will be led to substantial programs, off-setting the time-honored, but debilitating pattern of part-time preaching, one-room church religious program, and non-resident pastoral ministry.

Incidental to the above and correlated with it there must be a comparable denominational program toward strengthening rural churches and reorienting them toward a larger pastoral ministry. In spite of the fact that so many of our rural churches are demanding highly trained pastoral leadership, still in many cases, they do not know how to accept and follow that leadership, once they have obtained it. The denomination faces an increasing need to strengthen rural churches in order that they may provide for the financial and material needs of a full-time resident pastor and to develop in their midst a greater concern for a well-developed and well-balanced program of activities. More and more our southwide and state promotional agencies must begin focusing attention upon these peculiarly rural program needs.

As churches grow to the point at which they can under-

take a heavier program, they will need better leadership. As our seminaries produce better-trained leaders they will be able to raise the level of the program in rural churches. It seems, therefore, these two must work hand-in-hand.

Having considered in broad outline some of the needs of specialized training, the question comes as to how these needs may be met. Consideration needs to be given, therefore, to the methods to be used by our institutions to provide this specialized training.

Let us say first that the rural pastor needs the same basic training as the pastor of any other church. The basic disciplines of language study, Biblical interpretation, church history, systematic theology, philosophy of religion, etc., must continue to be the core of a pastor's preparation. The growth of our rural churches in this current crisis demands all the more that the man be well-grounded in these basic areas. It used to be thought that anyone could pastor a rural church, regardless of ability or preparation, but the modern revolution of rural people and their demands for the best trained leadership bring about conditions in which short cuts are more inappropriate than ever before. Brief ministerial training on the basis of an industrialized short course and all of the other substitutes are becoming increasingly inadequate unnecessary. Men who do not have preparation and those who have taken short cut measures of preparation will find themselves restricted more and more in their effectiveness. The rural pastor needs everything the city pastor needs by way of theological instruction, plus a little bit more. He is still dealing with people, and he needs all the leadership skills that are necessary to the direction of any church, with an additional slanting of those skills toward his distinctive needs.

Among the areas of specialized training over and above the routine of theological education, the rural pastor needs a definite introduction into the distinctive characteristics of rural people. Distinctive psychological traits of the rural population require that the pastor be trained to utilize those

basic characteristics in his leadership. He cannot treat rural people as though they were urban people. That is why we now have weak rural churches and weak rural church programs.

To be adequately trained, a pastor needs to be fully acquainted with the peculiar problems of rural churches. Rural churches have many problems in common with city churches, yet, in addition, they have problems all their own. The problems of a very limited population, which means a restricted potentiality for church evangelism, the limitations upon the stewardship means and possibilities of the people, the peculiar relations to occupational factors, financial uncertainties of agricultural adventures, the distinctive conservatism typical of rural people all mean that the pastor, to be adequately trained, must be prepared to cope with these peculiar problems.

A third area of need in the pastor's preparation is his ability and skill in adapting and fitting a program into a local situation. Most city churches can take the denominational program and apply it almost *in toto* to the local situation. Rural pastors are finding they must make ever enlarging adaptations of the over-all denominational program before it will fit into the needs of the local situation and produce the results that are desired by all concerned. One who does not know how or does not attempt to adapt these programs finds himself puzzling over the failure of his program to attain the desired ends. Skills in slanting and adjusting over-all projects into peculiar type needs and distinctive problems of the local situation explain the difference between success and failure in a rural pastorate.

A fourth area of distinctive training is in the peculiar relationship to the total rural church community in which the pastor finds himself. The pastor of a rural church is automatically in a place of leadership in his community. Of course, some do not attain to this leadership position nor utilize it for the advancement of the Kingdom of God because they lack the vision of a ministry which can infiltrate even secular institutions with spiritual objectives.

Most pastors of city churches do not enjoy this position of leadership. Very few in our larger cities come to the point of being outstanding citizens of the entire business community. Most city churches are in the residential and suburban areas and the pastor fits into the typical city pattern of every man tending to his own work and not knowing even his closest neighbor. The city pastor's work is in a specialized area with a specialized group.

On the contrary, the rural pastor works in all areas and has an opportunity of bearing the witness to the entire community in which he lives. He has a prestige equalled only occasionally by a small town physician, banker, or county superintendent of schools. The failure to take advantage of this unique privilege of utilizing his many opportunities to spread his Christian faith has been a weak point in Southern Baptist ministry. Rural pastors need additional training over and above what they are getting today in order to enable them to fit into the complex, yet strategic, position in the small town, village, or open country church. With the skills of community leadership, the rural church can and should regain its position of centrality in the entire life of the total community, which it enjoyed generations ago but which it subsequently lost to school, business, and professions. Adequately trained, the pastor of a rural church can lead his church back into a place of dominant influence in his community. The next few years will show an increasingly urgent need for the men who are pastors of the 23,000 rural churches in the Southern Baptist Convention to have more and better leadership training to enable them to take advantage of the growing opportunities of church leadership. Our denomination delays a period of outstanding growth until these objectives can be attained.

Baptist Principle Under Trial

BY JAMES M. BULMAN

There has been taking place in North Carolina in recent months something that is nothing less than a revolution in Baptist thought and life. And yet—perhaps partly because it is so much of a revolution that it is hard to make ourselves believe it, even when it is there before our eyes—the rank and file of Baptist folk seem largely unaware of just what has been happening. Halford Luccock has said that the really significant thing about Rip Van Winkle is not that he slept for twenty years, but that he slept through a revolution; which seems to describe the amazing situation that exists at present among a large segment of Baptists.

What has been taking place in North Carolina is the subjection of the Baptist principle of congregational independence to a severe trial; to so severe a trial, in fact, that this principle has actually been dissolved. Though the average North Carolina Baptist—minister as well as layman—seems pathetically unaware of it, his "independent" church no longer exists. For, by the recent North Carolina Supreme Court decision concerning the ownership of the property of the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church, our heretofore free and independent congregations have been in practical effect forged together into a general body, from which these congregations cannot secede. And this which has happened in North Carolina may well become the pattern elsewhere.

What is perhaps even more alarming is that this was not merely a court decision, but also the decision advocated by what would generally be regarded as the Baptist leadership in North Carolina. This amazing position taken by our leaders and our courts in North Carolina is the culmination of a movement that has been going on within Southern Baptist thought and life for some time. This movement had assumed so well-defined a pattern more than 20 years ago, that this more recent phase was discerned as likely to take place. This discernment was made by our

Southern Baptist historian, William Wright Barnes, who, in a book of true prophetic insight, attempted

> to show that there has been an ecclesiological development in Southern Baptist life comparable to the development that took place in the first centuries of Christian history—a development that laid the foundation of the medieval Catholic Church, out of which came the Roman Catholic Church of modern times (*The Southern Baptist Convention: A Study in the Development of Ecclesiology*, Fort Worth: Seminary Hill Press, 1934, reprint 1946; p. 1).

Among the book's many arresting statements, quite instructive are some remarks about the ownership of church property; especially instructive, in fact, in view of the part that Dr. Barnes himself has come to play in the North Carolina conflict. He asks, "Does the civil power, that played so important a part in the early centuries and during the middle ages, take any part in Southern Baptist development?" (*ibid.*, p. 9). He answers, "Very little thus far, except as an example, but it may be just beginning to do so" (*loc. cit.*). And after mentioning some alarming legal trends, he states,

> Let the Southern Baptist Convention be taken by the civil courts as the standard for the denomination, and the convention will have an equity in every building belonging to every church affiliated with it, even as the Presbyterian Church in the United States (southern church) has an equity in the property of every congregational unit in its membership (*loc. cit.*).

Of perhaps even more interest is the following:

> There was never a legal definition of an American citizen until the War Between the States made secession from the union of states illegal and impossible and assured the permanence of the national union. What manner of war or controversy or upheaval will bring to birth a constitutionally recognized Southern Baptist Church from which any group of Baptists may not secede? (*ibid.*, p. 31).

And is it not strange that when the first shot of this envisaged conflict was fired, Dr. Barnes—of all people—hastened to enlist with the Union forces!

The event that may be likened in this connection to the firing on Fort Sumter took place in North Carolina, in the summer of 1953, when the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church decided by a nearly two to one majority to discontinue cooperation with the program of the Southern Baptist Convention. The minority protested, taking the matter to court; and in the legal battle that ensued, prominent Baptist leaders championed the denial of the Baptist principle of congregational independence. This denial will now be considered.

The Baptist Principle Denied

However reluctant one might be in presenting these facts, primary consideration must be given not to *personalities,* however highly esteemed, nor to *party,* but rather to the basic *principle* involved. In order to reveal the extent to which a principle long accepted among Southern Baptists has now been denied by certain denominational leaders, it becomes necessary to quote in some detail from the testimony which they gave during the trial of the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church case. Those most prominently involved were William Wright Barnes, who as we have seen had warned twenty years earlier of the very thing in which he now participated; and, from North Carolina, Harold W. Tribble, M. A. Huggins, Edward A. McDowell, and Douglas Branch.

To testify against the right of the majority of a local congregation to discontinue its denominational affiliation would be embarrassing enough a situation for any Baptist leader. But this was especially embarrassing for certain of the leaders who testified in this Nash County Superior Court trial in the fall of 1953, for they had previously written books setting forth explicitly the principle of complete congregational autonomy that was later denied at the trial. How did they try to account for what they had previously written?

Dr. W. W. Barnes sought to account for what he had

written concerning this issue by saying that he had come to *change his mind.* Concerning some sentences in his book to which we have already referred, he testified[1]:

> When I wrote, "All Baptist general bodies are voluntary organizations established by individuals who wish to cooperate for some common end or ends in extending the Kingdom of God. This convention is not an ecclesiastical body or federal body composed of state conventions. Churches may cooperate with these general organizations but always on a purely voluntary basis and without surrendering in any degree their right of self-determination," that was twenty years ago and what I believed, but I have learned more about Baptists and I don't agree with it (R., p. 103).

Yet, in spite of changing his mind concerning what he had written in 1934, he allowed the book to be re-issued in 1946, without the addition of one written word intimating of such change; nor did he have the book withdrawn previous to the trial (nor, as far as as we know, since the trial[2]). His stated reason for allowing continued distribution of the book was to let it be known *"what had been taught and is being taught now by some"* (R., p. 103). Obliging, indeed, to supply such information of "historical" significance! But would it have been too much to have asked that one, upon buying this book from one of our Baptist Book Stores, be given some slight intimation that it merely represented what the author *used* to believe, and that the author had actually come to adopt an altogether opposite position? It is to be emphasized that the recanting of the few lines quoted above from this book does not even begin to give an adequate idea

---

1. In reproducing the testimony given in the Superior Court trial, we are using the official court record (Index no. 95, Second District, Supreme Court of North Carolina, Fall Term, 1954). This material will henceforth be designated as "R." All emphasis given to the testimony herein reproduced has been supplied by the present writer.

2. Dr. Barnes has evidently been misled as to the extent of distribution of copies of this book. He testified: "Book stores handled the book two or three years [since 1946] but not since then" (R., p. 104). Yet, six months after this testimony, the present writer had no difficulty in securing a copy from the Baptist Book Store in Charlotte, North Carolina.

of the vast gulf separating the position taken by Dr. Barnes at the trial from that taken in his book. It is not a matter of a difference in viewpoint about a paragraph or a page, but rather of the whole theme of the book being utterly repudiated.

Dr. H. W. Tribble, President of Wake Forest College, took a different approach in seeking to account for some previous statements which he had made. He sought to *interpret* these statements so as to have them understood in accordance with his position at the trial. There was introduced in court the following from his book, *Our Doctrines*:

> Two or more churches may work together . . . as long as they agree. But one may withdraw at any time, and the others can exercise no authority to restrain it. . . . Our churches cooperate in associations, state conventions, and the Southern Baptist Convention. Yet all of these relations are voluntary. Neither the association, nor the state convention, nor the Southern Baptist Convention, can exercise the least authority over any individual church. This principle sometimes works to produce temporary embarrassment, but in the end it works out for the best. We may well adhere to it, for it is a New Testament principle and it has been tried and found worthy (R., p. 371; cf. *Our Doctrines,* Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1936; pp. 110-111).

Had the "embarrassment" now become too great to allow this New Testament principle to operate? Dr. Tribble gave under oath the following interpretation of the above statements:

> The question is whether a church has the right to withdraw from this cooperative venture and carry with it a group of members in the church who want to continue to cooperate, and to carry the property built up by virtue of this cooperative plan. I think that is the question, and on that score I would say that it would be a violation of the customs, practices, and doctrines of the Baptist church for that to happen (R., p. 407).

Thus, while it had been said that a church "may withdraw at any time" from the denominational program, this is now interpreted to mean that a church may not withdraw if there is any minority at all to oppose such action. Or at least it could not thus withdraw and retain possession of its property; and of this it may be asked, Of what significance is recognition of a right of withdrawal that would not involve property possession? A group in a Roman Catholic congregation would be free to withdraw if that involved no property possession. Who, of the several thousands of readers of this very popular study-course book, would have had the slightest suspicion that this statement, seemingly expressing so clearly a church's right to withdrawal, was actually *denying* to a church that right as long as there would be opposition from any kind of minority—thereby giving to this ever-so-small a group sole possession of the property!

Also, there was cited the following from Dr. Tribble's *The Baptist Faith* (which he had written as a revision of E. Y. Mullins' *The Axioms of Religion*):

> The Baptist principle is that a church cooperates with a general body whose objects and aims it approves, not delegating authority in any sense, or binding itself beyond its expressed purpose, and always reserving the right of dissent or withdrawal at pleasure (R., p. 370; cf. *The Baptist Faith*, Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1935; p. 112).

Dr. Tribble asked that the above statement be considered "in terms of the total context" (R., p. 405). He asked in particular that the statement be taken in connection with what he had written about the need of a "cohesive principle":

> I should like to read a statement from page 18: "A New Cohesive Principle Needed—If they (referring to denominations) are to meet the tests and rise to new heights of service in the Kingdom of God, there must be some motive or cohesive principle strong enough to give them unity." That gives the spirit of the book. The entire book then undertakes to

> interpret these basic principles in terms of a cohesive unity that will become practical, fruitful and in complete harmony with the basic principles of the Baptist faith (R., p. 405).

Would not one wonder, however, whether Dr. Tribble's rather vague "cohesive principle" should not be interpreted, in considering the issue at hand, in terms of his very specific pronouncement as to a church "always reserving the right of withdrawal at pleasure?"

Dr. M. A. Huggins, General Secretary of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina, followed Dr. Tribble's procedure of attempting to *interpret* what he had written as being in harmony with his position at the trial; also he followed Dr. Barnes' procedure of attempting to show that he had come to *change his mind;* and in addition he brought in an entirely different approach, simply stating that he *did not mean what he said when he wrote his book!* Here is his attempt to account for what he had written in his *North Carolina for Christ*:

> I would not say a Baptist Church is one local congregation, that and nothing more; a Baptist Church is a local congregation, but I wouldn't say it is that and nothing more. I will agree, as I understand it, that there is no such thing as the Baptist Church in the sense that one may speak of the Methodist Church or the Presbyterian Church. I do not agree with the statement that when Baptist Churches join forces they do not surrender any of their autonomy.
>
> I am acquainted with this work here; I wrote this book. The saying, "The Baptist Church is one local congregation, that and nothing more," is in my book. I wrote it. The words "Baptist Church" is in quotation marks, not the rest of it. I want you to mark that. I am saying, in answer to your question, that it is a local congregation, but any organization that has any human element when it joins a larger group, of necessity, surrenders a little something of its absolute autonomy to the larger group by way of cooperation. *That is my interpretation on what I meant when I wrote that.* I think you are

taking one statement out of a total context. This book was written for cooperating Baptist churches. I wrote the following: "There is no such thing as the Baptist Church in the sense that one may speak of the Methodist Church or the Presbyterian Church. The Baptist Church is one local congregation, that and nothing more. It is the body of Christ, a living organism. The Baptist denomination is an organization which came into existence about 150 years ago because some members of a Baptist Church discovered that the world-wide mission of the local church could not become effective unless Baptist churches worked together. When, therefore, these churches joined forces they did not surrender, and do not now surrender, any of their autonomy."

I did not mean what I said when I wrote that. That was written about 15 years ago. The original was written 13 years ago. It was revised. To be exact, it would be 13 years. That is a revisal of the original written 13 years ago. The copy from which that was read is a revisal. I do not recall when I revised it, but would give you an approximation of 1948, probably. I revised part of this book about five years ago. Since 1948 *I have somewhat changed my views.* I haven't done anything about withdrawing this book from circulation. I would not be able to state positively that I have not printed anything that contradicts anything in the revised edition. I don't know whether I have in talks and speeches.

At the time this revisal came out, some of the body was just picked up, not carefully, and some added to it, to bring part of it up-to-date as far as figures were concerned (R., pp. 147-148).

And of course, the leaders had to account for what had been written by others. There was the rather embarrassing letter which the Executive Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, Porter Routh, had written to the Clerk of the North Rocky Mount Church on August 19, 1953 (and had written spontaneously, as a North Carolina attorney, William

C. Lassiter points out[3]). Dr. Tribble sought to *interpret* this letter so as to have it harmonize with the position of the Baptist leadership at the trial. He stated:

> It is not true that I was so upset by what he had said in his first letter that I wanted to get him down here to repudiate it. I did not want him to explain it away. I have known Mr. Routh for a number of years. I taught him at the seminary and I felt that his statement taken out of context as it was presented here at the hearing did not adequately represent the position of the convention concerning this matter of cooperation. I think the letter as a whole revolves around a paragraph that was quoted at the hearing before, the second paragraph reading as follows: "To me, one of the glories of the Baptist denomination is the fact that any church can vote to affiliate or not to affiliate with any group it desires, in seeking to follow what it feels to be God's will." I had the feeling then, and I have the feeling now, that that statement does not take adequate account of what is involved in this question with reference to the cooperation of the church across the years and the right of any group of members in the church with reference to continuing to affiliate" (R., p. 403).

It will be observed that this explanation by Dr. Tribble not only attempts to interpret Mr. Routh's statement in a manner contrary to what would be regarded as its obvious meaning, but also to cast some *discredit* upon it. Thus the president of the North Carolina State Baptist Convention, Douglas Branch, when confronted by a statement that had been written by Dr. Gaines S. Dobbins, whose extensive knowledge of the administrative side of Baptist church life would make his pronouncement exceptionally important, seemed to question the competence of this esteemed thinker to discuss such an issue:

---

3. Mr. Lassiter, a Baptist and a trustee of one of our denominational colleges, has made a special study of the North Rocky Mount controversy, and has set forth his conclusions in an extremely valuable paper, to which he has given a limited private circulation, and from which excerpts were printed in the *Christian Century* (Feb. 23, 1955). All quotations from Mr. Lassiter by the present writer have been taken from this paper.

> As far as I know, this is the only book he has written dealing with doctrines. Dr. Dobbins is not a theologian and he is not a church historian. His work has been in the field of Christian education, in the Baptist denomination (R., p. 222). Whereupon Rev. Branch asserted: "I do not agree with the statement [by Dr. Dobbins], 'nor does any association have the right to exercise any authority over any individual church'."

Concerning the widely-recognized work by Edward T. Hiscox, Dr. Barnes said, "I do not consider that work as an authority. It is his opinion" (R., p. 107). And he went so far as to say:

> I do not know of any book on Baptist customs, practices, and usages that is recognized by Baptists generally as an authority on those subjects. There are dozens of books—some take this and some that—but I do not know of even one or two that might be considered authorities (R., p. 282).

In regard to this latter point of testimony, William C. Lassiter states:

> This statement is particularly disillusioning to a Baptist layman who has gone to the books published by men in the Baptist movement who are described as leaders to attempt to learn something of the Baptist heritage and the customs and practices. If there are no authoritative publications, how can the ordinary Baptist layman or even the Baptist minister acquire reliable knowledge and information on this subject? It would seem that one cannot even rely upon what the "Official historian" of the Southern Baptist Convention has published on this subject, for in the trial of this case he repudiated what he had written and published 1934 and republished in 1946, and he had never prior to the testimony he gave here made any effort to correct or retract what he had so published and republished.

"Nevertheless," Mr. Lassiter continues, in spite of this statement by Dr. Barnes,

> the attorneys for all parties to this lawsuit stipulated and agreed (Record, p. 368) that the writers of the various books, excerpts from which were intro-

duced into the evidence in the case, "are recognized as authorities as to customs, practices, usages and doctrines of Missionary Baptist Churches generally."

But does not Dr. Barnes' contention, that there is no generally-agreed-upon authority for determining Baptist church polity, become a boomerang against his position? For if, as Dr. Barnes argues, there is no recognized standard as to what constitutes Baptist belief and practice, so that "some take this and some that,"—then does this not but emphasize all the stronger the fact that each individual church's freedom under God is not subject to external determination as to its customs, practices, and usages?

The above survey of the testimony of our leaders at the trial should make it evident that a revolutionary change has come about within the thinking of our Baptist leadership. And this change in the conception of congregational independence has taken place in the thinking of some of the very men who had in the past been most vocal in proclaiming the congregational principle. Indeed, the force of this revolutionary movement has become so great as to pull into its vortex even a man like Dr. Barnes, who had warned against just such dangers to which this movement might lead.

How can we explain this truly amazing situation? However we explain it, one factor stands out: the denominational program has come to claim and to be given the final allegiance. This program is the thing that must be preserved at all cost; even at the sacrifice of the most time-honored Baptist, yea New Testament, principles. Thus it would seem that our leaders have come around to changing their position for the sole purpose of preserving denominational unity.

Let it be acknowledged that our leaders have been doing what they sincerely feel is best for the preservation of our Baptist program. But have not the demands for expediency blinded them to the fundamental issue of the principle involved?

We should not, of course, minimize the importance of preserving denominational unity. But we are simply de-

feating our own purpose unless we seek to preserve that unity upon a Baptistic basis. Now how can we have 30,000 free and independent Baptist churches, and yet have them working together in one great cooperative endeavor? Only by our people being committed to essentially the same beliefs and by their being instructed as to the nature of our larger Baptist work. This does not mean that on every little particular we must follow a certain interpretation; but it does mean that on the great essentials of the faith we must be together. But this, the only proper basis for our having denominational unity, has in recent years come to be denied—both in theory and in practice. In many Baptist circles an extreme anti-creedal attitude has prevailed; it virtually being claimed that it does not make any difference what one believes. This attitude has been all summed up in the famous answer given to the question, "What is a Baptist?" —the answer being, "It depends on where one lives." This really means that there is nothing that distinguishes Baptists doctrinally, which must allow one to believe literally anything under the sun and yet be a good Baptist. Now if this be the case, if we do not have an essentially doctrinal basis for our unity, *then on what basis can we have unity?* There is only one other basis, and that is what is more and more coming to be adopted: it is *loyalty to the denominational program.* In other words, if we are not to have a unity based on loyalty to *principle,* then it must be based on loyalty to *party.* That is the position to which Baptists have been coming for sometime.

It would seem, then, that what has brought about the change in the thinking of our leaders is the need that is felt for maintaining denominational unity, after we have moved away from what is the only real basis for having unity on Baptist lines. Thus expediency has evolved a new dogma for us: a local church *must* be a part of the denominational program. Here we have what is essentially the principle underlying Roman Catholicism; making loyalty to the organization the supreme thing. And in this situation we have one extreme following as a logical consequence from

another extreme. We have come a long, long way from saying in effect that you can be a good Baptist regardless of what you believe, to saying in effect that you must follow what the Convention says! We have come all the way from an extreme individualism, which is really of the essence of liberalism, to what is hardly other than an authoritarian-ecclesiasticism. But such is the logic of events. We have allowed the pendulum to move too far in one direction, which means that it must swing back to a like extreme in the other direction. Thus the amazing change which has taken place in the thinking of our leaders is but a development of the logic of events. It is a reaping of what has been sown. Men may not always be consistent, but consistency will work its way out. The whirligig of time will bring its bitter revenge.

It is possible, of course, to inject irrelevant issues. We are not concerned in this connection with whether or not the seceding group at Rocky Mount did the right thing; indeed, as cooperating Baptists we would certainly say that they did not. The question is, did they, as the majority of an autonomous congregation, have a right to do what they did? And concerning this, as far as Baptist principle is concerned, there can be no doubt. Of course, majority rule can lead to dangerous excesses; but such are the unavoidable dangers inherent in the democratic system. The only way for our people to be protected against following an unscrupulous demagogue who would disrupt our program, is for them to be instructed in and committed to the principles of our faith and the nature of our larger Baptist work.

The Baptist Principle Examined

While there can be no doubt as to what has been the accepted Baptist principle as regards the matter which we have been discussing, it might be well to examine this principle, since it has come to be repudiated by these leaders. Can we have been wrong in following this principle down through the years? Need we adjust our ecclesiological conceptions, as Dr. Barnes has argued, in accordance with

certain factors involving a development in Baptist polity within recent years?

(1) Let us examine the Baptist principle from the standpoint of the *composition* of *associations* and *conventions*. As to what has been the Baptist principle in this regard, we may refer to Hiscox:

> An association—the organized body that meets for business—is *not* composed of churches, but of individuals, the pastors and messengers. It is a common way of speaking, but a very loose and misleading way, to say it is composed of churches. This arises from a misapprehension, and perpetuates a misunderstanding. A Baptist Church cannot be a member of any other body whatever. It would violate its sacred charter, and lose its identity as the body of Christ, to attempt such a union. And if many churches should enter into organic relations, and constitute an ecclesiastical confederation, the local churches would be absorbed, losing largely individuality and their independence. Also, in that case, the confederate body would possess legislative and judicial control over the separate congregations. This is the actual *status* of most Christian denominations. But our polity and our traditions repudiate both the inference, and the hypothesis on which it rests.
>
> But it may be asked, How is it, if churches are not *members* of the body, that the Associations uniformly receive new churches to their number, or dismiss or drop churches from it? The reply is this, Churches are not received to *membership*, though such expressions are often, and indeed ordinarily used; but they are received to *fellowship* and *cooperation;* which fact is evinced, by their pastors and messengers being admitted to *membership*, thus composing its constituent elements.
>
> . . . As a single Association covers a limited extent of territory, and the various Associations, whose boundaries touch, hold no organic relation to each other, but each working for the same end, in a similar way, it has been thought wise to have a more general organization, extending over and embracing the fields of all the Associations in the State. This is called a *Baptist State Convention* . . .

> The membership of Conventions . . . is composed of persons (Edward T. Hiscox, *The New Directory for Baptist Churches*, Philadelphia: The Judson Press, sixteenth printing, 1941, pp, 333-334, 339-340. Of Hiscox's book, A. H. Strong, who, with the possible exception of E. Y. Mullins, has been the leading Baptist theologian in this century, has said: it is the "most complete and satisfactory manual on the subject extant. I regard it as surprisingly accurate and faithful in its presentation of our polity and usages").

With the foregoing statements, Dr. Barnes had previously expressed thorough agreement. Now, however, he feels that the "convention is a body composed of churches" (R., p. 106). His basis for espousing this new idea is said to be found in the common speech that Baptists have come to employ:

> In many of our general bodies, associations especially, and in our common every-day talk and customary use, 999 out of 1,000 Baptist preachers say that such and such a church is a member of the Southern Baptist Convention (R., p. 108).

Now the reader certainly noted in the above quotation from Hiscox that it was acknowledged that, according to a common way of speaking, the associations are said to be composed of churches. But, as Hiscox very well put it, this way of speaking is "very loose and misleading;" that is, it would be contrary to what is inherent in the Baptist system to make this loose way of speaking determinative for understanding this system. Since the association is composed of individuals *from* churches, it becomes very easy to focus our attention mainly on these churches from which the individuals come as messengers, and thus to think of the association as composed of the churches themselves.

As Mr. Lassiter has keenly observed, Dr. Barnes' contention, that the associations and conventions are composed of churches, is in direct conflict with the Baptist State Constitution of North Carolina, which, interestingly enough, was not used in evidence in the trial. Article III of that constitution states:

> The Convention shall be composed of (1) two *messengers* from each co-operating church, and one additional *messenger* from each church for every hundred members or major fraction thereof, beyond the first one hundred members; provided that no church shall be entitled to more than ten messengers. No one shall be a messenger who is not a member of a church co-operating with the Convention, and messengers must be duly elected by their churches, a cooperating church shall be one that supports any object of the Convention; and (2) the *officers* of the Convention, the *members of the General Board*, the *editor* of the *Biblical Recorder*, and the *President* of the Woman's Missionary Union.

Also, Dr. Barnes' contention is in conflict with the constitution of Roanoke Baptist Association, to which the Rocky Mount Baptist Church had sent messengers. That constitution specifically states that its membership is composed of *persons* (R., p. 79).

And shortly after claiming that the Southern Baptist Convention is composed of churches, Dr. Barnes made this admission: "It is true that membership in the Convention shall consist of *messengers* who are members of Missionary Baptist Churches cooperating with the Convention" (R., p. 108; cf. Article III of the Southern Baptist Convention Constitution).

And yet, in spite of his position being thus explicitly contradicted by *the actual custom and usage* as concerns the relation of the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church to the Association, the State Convention, and the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. Barnes has had the boldness to insist that any conclusion as to Baptist polity must be derived from actual custom and usage (*Review and Expositor*, April, 1955, p. 204; cf. R., p. 282)!

(2) Next, the Baptist principle may be examined from the standpoint of the *authority* of the *conventions* and *associations*. Though having said in his book that churches in cooperating with the denominational programs and organizations do so "always on a purely voluntary basis and

without surrendering in any degree their right of self-determination," Dr. Barnes has come to feel otherwise. Thus he testified that when the churches "join" these larger organizations "they have to surrender some of their right of self-determination" (R., p. 103). Thus he tells us that the associations "have a *certain measure of authority* or *influence that borders on authority* over the various churches that belong to the Association" (R., p. 104). And we are told:

> An individual church had limited its autonomy when it joined the larger body. It has limited itself, it has limited its authority itself, when it and these others are working together, and there through the centuries of those governing bodies working together in *a larger body that exercises the authority* (R., p. 181).

This reasoning is based on the premise that the church has "joined the larger body," in the sense of becoming one of the parts composing the larger body; and this, as we have already seen, is not true. And where is there any proof of the larger body by right exercising authority over the churches? The denominational organizations may, to be sure, so assert themselves as to have what Dr. Barnes calls "an influence that borders on authority;" but who would regard the exertion of such influence as other than a usurpation? And as Dr. Barnes himself acknowledged at the trial,

> There is, and there has been for some time, in the Constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention, Article IV, the following: "Authority: While independent and sovereign in its own sphere, the Convention does not claim and will never attempt to exercise any authority over any other Baptist body, whether church, auxiliary organization, association, or convention" (R., pp. 107-108).

Rev. Douglas Branch argued that the association "does have the right to say whether that church shall be a part of the association or not, and in that sense it has authority" (R., p. 222). But this is confusing two separate spheres of sovereignty. As the Southern Baptist Convention Constitution was just quoted as saying, the Convention is "in-

dependent and sovereign in its own sphere;" and this of course would allow for it to fix the requirements as to membership within its organization. And it is the same with the state convention and the association. But sovereignty in these spheres does not conflict with the sovereignty which the church enjoys in its own sphere. The church, acting within the sphere of its sovereignty, can decide whether or not to send a messenger to the association; and the association, acting within the sphere of its sovereignty, can decide whether or not to accept the messenger into its membership. But regardless as to what the association does, that sphere of sovereignty enjoyed by the local church is still not invaded.

Rev. Branch's above contention represents in essence the whole argument of Dr. Barnes' recent article (*Review and Expositor,* April, 1955). The latter states: "associations . . . have decided for themselves between factions in a divided Baptist church which faction was the true church" (*ibid.,* p. 202). That is, an association naturally can decide which group is to be recognized by the *association;* but still, as Dr. Barnes admitted under oath, "An association cannot compel either group in a church to abide by any decision which the association or group of other churches undertakes to make" (R., p. 180).

As for the historic Baptist claim that the New Testament presents the churches as independent and autonomous, we may consider the following from Hiscox, as giving the impression which a reading of the New Testament epistles naturally conveys:

> The Apostles regarded and treated the churches as independent bodies, having the rights of self-government, without subjection to any other authority. They reported their own doings to the churches, and addressed their epistles to them, as to independent bodies, and not to a confederacy, including many distinct congregations; nor yet to any official representatives of these congregations. In communicating with them the Apostles recognized their right to choose their own officers, to admit,

> discipline, and exclude members; primary and fundamental rights, which, being conceded, imply all other rights necessary to a self-governing community, acting under divinely enacted laws. They also enjoined upon them, as the responsible and authoritative executives of this power, and exclusion of unworthy members (Hiscox, *op. cit.*, p. 155).

Dr. Edward A. McDowell, Professor of New Testament at Southeastern Seminary, purported at the trial to interpret the New Testament as denying the concept of congregational independence. If a church "gets out of an association and tries to have an independent existence," he asserted, "then it ceases to be a Baptist church in the New Testament sense" (R., p. 195). It should be sufficient to give the reply of Mr. Lassiter, who as a layman states: "I must confess that I have not yet run across a passage of the New Testament which has reference to a 'Convention' or an 'Association' of churches." Yet we should like to raise some questions at this point, such as, Where were Baptist churches before Conventions were formed?, and, Once these Conventions were formed, did that involve a surrender of prerogatives previously reserved entirely to the congregations?, and, If there has been such a surrender of the autonomy of the churches, by whom was this decision made and when?

(3) The Baptist principle must be examined from the standpoint of the right of *majority rule* by the members of a congregation. If, as has been contended above, a Baptist church is independent, with no denominational organizations exercising authority over it, it must be autonomous. It must be governed by its membership alone. Thus a Baptist church is a "democracy;" the word meaning "rule by the people." Now if there should be any disagreement among the people as to an issue, what could be done? Obviously, the issue would have to be decided by the greater number of the people. As stated by Hiscox, "The government is administered by the body acting together, where no one possesses a preeminence, but all enjoy an equality of rights; and in deciding matters of opinion, the majority bears rule" (Hiscox, *op. cit.*, p. 144).

The propriety of this principle has been called in question by our leaders in the recent North Carolina conflict. It has been contended that this principle is inapplicable when a church is confronted with the issue of whether or not to continue cooperation with the denominational program. But, clearly, if a Baptist church is to be a democracy, then all issues must be decided by majority rule. Of course, a church may decide that on particular matters a two-thirds vote, or even a unanimous vote, is necessary; however, this very decision as to what kind of vote is to be required must obviously be made on the basis of the will of the majority. As the matter has been so clearly stated by H. E. Dana:

> If those constituting a church voluntarily enter into a covenant of association as members of a local church, without external authority, then it logically follows that they have a right to the final voice in the church. In order for this principle to operate the local church must be an independent body, governed by the majority of its membership (*A Manual of Ecclesiology*, Kansas City: Central Seminary Press, 1944, pp. 225-226).

To be sure, unanimous agreement is the ideal. Nevertheless, as Dana goes on to say, "if the minority for reasons sufficient to themselves must remain irreconcilable," then—though as Dana specifices, this should be as a last resort—"the voice of the majority must prevail" (*ibid.*, p. 228).

It is interesting to read the attempt of Rev. Douglas Branch to handle this matter in the trial:

> I do not know the vote required in the Swelton Heights admission. . . . I do not know that a simple majority of the members present would be all that would be necessary to go in. If they had no constitution and customs, I suppose that is the democratic way. The Baptist church is supposed at least to be democratic. Unless they had customs or rules relating to that, I would say that a simple majority would be all that is necessary to get in to the association, by vote of the congregation. There are some matters when you are operating under a constitution, when a two-thirds vote is necessary. I suppose

that unless the congregation determined there was too much opposition or something like that to obtain harmony within the church, that the majority would rule. It normally would.

You have asked if I know of any reason a simple majority vote by the congregation would not be sufficient to withdraw a church from an association. I know of no custom by which a church by a majority vote may disassociate the church from its usual customs. The Baptist church is operated on the basis of their meetings, on the basis of a majority rule, in all their meetings. That is the general custom, but there are rare exceptions. It is the custom in Baptist churches that a simple majority is all that is necessary to carry a vote, provided the matter which is being voted on does not create a sharp cleavage from the usual customs and procedures of the church. In which case, you have a division of the church, instead of taking a simple vote, say a majority, and everybody saying, "Well, the majority has voted this way, we'll all be happy about it," as would be the case if it were a matter of purchasing a building, buying a building, a matter of that sort. If it was a matter of disassociating the church or creating a sharp cleavage, one group then would either adhere to the usual practices of the church and one group would make a break with those, the case of spiritual cleavage, you could not have the same situation that you had if everybody would be happy about the majority vote. It then becomes incumbent upon somebody, if the question is raised, to decide which group is which. Whether a simple majority is all that is necessary to carry a motion or resolution depends on the motion or resolution (R., pp. 216-217).

This piece of testimony bristles with inconsistencies. It is admitted that the majority of the congregation must decide whether the church shall seek affiliation with the association (unless, of course, the *majority* should decide that more than a majority would be necessary for such a decision). But why not with a church seeking withdrawal? The answer is, "I know of no custom by which a church by a majority vote may disassociate the church from its usual

customs." That is, once *affiliation* of the church with the association is in practice, then a church cannot by majority vote decide to dissolve this affiliation (though just *why,* is not clear). But, before a church has come into fellowship with the association, then *non-affiliation* is certainly in practice. And if the church can go against the practice of *non-affiliation* by majority vote, then why could it not go against the practice of *affiliation* by majority vote? But just why cannot an autonomous church, if it so desires, decide by a simple majority vote even an issue that would create sharp cleavage? Indeed, are not such issues being decided in this way from time to time? And, just who is to determine, *except the majority of the congregation,* whether or not the impending issue might create such cleavage that a mere majority vote would not be admissible? Following Rev. Branch's line of reasoning, could a pastor be dismissed from a congregation without a unanimous vote? Or, could a church buy a building, or even do anything that would displease anybody, except by a unanimous vote? (In which case, a stubborn minority of one could successfully block any move desired by the church). And where it *has been a part of the custom* of the church to settle things by a *majority* vote, by what authority would Rev. Branch deny to the majority its right to decide on any issue, however severe the cleavage? It is especially instructive in this regard to consider the telling point made by Mr. Lassiter, when he observes that one very fundamental usage, custom, and practice of the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church was that

> of MAJORITY RULE which had existed and had been accepted by both factions prior to dissension. That the usage, custom and practice of majority rule had existed . . . was testified to. . . . A careful examination of the Record of the case failed to reveal any testimony to the contrary.[5]

5. This point is especially significant in view of the Supreme Court's decision (to be discussed presently) to the effect that, in the event of a split, a church must follow that which both factions had accepted prior to the dissension.

The plea has been made that a *majority* really did not decide the issue at Rocky Mount, since "this majority numbered only 241 out of a church membership of 1,300" (*Biblical Recorder,* editorial, March 5, 1955). But we may answer in the words of Dr. William Harrison Williams:

> . . . but the fact remains that it was known that such action was to be voted on and they [the other members] were not present. If we go on the assumption that the action of a church is not legal unless the entire membership has expressed itself, can we consider any action which a church may take as having any meaning? ("How Shall We Guard a Baptist Church?", *Biblical Recorder,* April 16, 1955).

The Baptist Principle Dissolved

The Superior Court of Nash County handed down the following decision in the case of the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church in December of 1953:

> . . . the true congregation in church organizations is those who adhere and submit to the regular order of the church, local and *general,* whether a majority or minority of membership (R., p. 68).

Thus, since the nearly two to one majority of the membership, in voting to sever relationship with the convention program, had "departed from the fundamental usages, customs, doctrine, practice and organization of the North Rocky Mount Missionary Baptist Church and of the *denomination,*" this majority, therefore, was "not a part of the true congregation" (R., p. 68). With this decision being allowed to stand, the Baptist principle would obviously be dissolved in North Carolina; for the decision would bring into being a GENERAL Baptist Church, of which the individual congregations would be parts, and from which these congregations could not secede.

In December of 1954, the North Carolina Supreme Court sustained the Superior Court's judgment, in that the property was awarded to the minority. However, there was some modification in the decision, in that the true congregation was defined as consisting of "members of the congre-

gation who adhere and submit to the characteristic doctrines, usages, customs and practices of this particular church, recognized and accepted by both factions of the congregation before the dissension between them arose" (*North Carolina Supreme Court Reports,* Vol. 241, No. III, p. 215). As pointed out by Mr. Lassiter, this decision "*theoretically*" refused to recognize the existence of a General Baptist Church. However, as far as *practical results* are concerned, congregational independence is no more allowed for than in the Superior Court decision. For, with support of the Convention having become a practice of the churches, this practice could not be done away with so long as any kind of minority would be willing to contest the matter in court; in which event, the minority—even if consisting of but one person—would be given control of the church property. Thus the opinion that some have expressed (*e.g.,* the editorial introduction to the *Review and Expositor,* April, 1955, p. 142), that the Supreme Court decision is in line with congregational independence, is illusory.

Concerning this decision, Secretary Porter Routh, who because of his denominational position would naturally be expected to be hesitant in publicly clashing with what has become more or less the official denominational position on this issue, acknowledged: "I doubt if this has ever been defined in this particular way" (Associated Press dispatch, March 3, 1955). "In that degree," he said, "it is breaking new ground" (*loc. cit.*). New ground, indeed! As Mr. Lassiter has said, the court has actually come to "compel continued cooperation with and support of the State and Southern Baptist Conventions by a particular local Baptist Church, in spite of the wishes of a clear majority of the congregation."

Rev. Douglas Branch said that the decision demonstrates that a church structure "does not belong to a congregation at any particular time" (*loc. cit.*). Rather, he said, it belongs to "both the dead and the living" whose cumulative gifts have built it to serve God according to convictions of "a particular denomination of persuasion" (*loc. cit.*). Thus

the *dead* are part owners of church property! If we may entertain such a ludicrous suggestion for a moment: How, then, could a church even voting unanimously withdraw from support of the convention? For there would still be a group of members—which well might be a majority—with a claim to the property. And with the assumption being made that these dead would desire continued support of the convention, how would the issue be resolved? Would the convention representatives be given the property as "heirs"? But the appeal to the dead has been made in a less ridiculous light, as in this editorial statement in the *Biblical Recorder*:

> The question at issue was not that of religious faith and practice but the protection of money and property which had been given in good conscience for sacred purposes. There should be no breach of trust with the living or dead who gave in support of our historic Baptist faith and practices (March 5, 1955).

But by what logic is it assumed that those who have died purposed that their church *of necessity* be a part of the denominational program? Indeed, must we not conclude, from all that Baptists have in the past said about congregational independence, that it is actually a very serious *breach of trust* with the *dead* for property, which they purchased to be used by independent congregations, to be made forever part and parcel of the Convention? Far from keeping faith with the dead, this unfaithfulness of our leaders to historic Baptist principle is enough to cause the dead to turn over in their graves!

In this recent article, Dr. Barnes appeals to a volume of jurisprudence as stating that a majority of an independent congregation may not divert the property "to the support of doctrines radically and fundamentally opposed to its characteristic doctrine" (*Review and Expositor*, April, 1955, p. 203). *But has there been any principle more characteristic of Baptists than recognition of a congregation's right to refuse cooperation with the denominational program?* And, as Mr. Lassiter points out,

> it is particularly interesting to observe that in the case of the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church, that local Baptist church was established and the church property was conveyed to the local church trustees PRIOR to the church's cooperating with the Association or the State or Southern Baptist Conventions. (cf. R., p. 55).

Furthermore, taking as the standard the constitution of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina (not used as evidence in the trial), the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church had *not even ceased to be a cooperating church!* The section quoted above from that constitution gave as the sole definition of a cooperating church, "one that supports *any* object of the Convention;" and this that church had continued to do, in contributing funds to the Baptist Orphanage (cf. Supreme Court Reports, cited above, p. 213). If, therefore, it is to be maintained—in utter contradiction to the Baptist principle of congregational independence—that a church must be a cooperating church in order to be true to its basic character, then it must be allowed that, by the constitution of its own State Convention, the North Rocky Mount Baptist Church was still a cooperating church, entitled to send messengers to the Convention.

Can the Baptist Principle Be Recovered?

As pointed out above, the Supreme Court *theoretically* recognized the independence of the local church. While the *actual situation* thus created is one in which the churches of necessity will be a part of the Convention, yet *this theoretical acknowledgement of congregational independence provides a way whereby the actual situation can be changed.* As things now stand, a church desiring to discontinue fellowship with the Convention cannot do so if there is any sort of minority opposing such action; for the true congregation has been declared to be that group following the practice which both factions recognized before the dissension arose. But what if a church now agrees to adopt a practice whereby it will be recognized that the majority is to retain possession of the property regardless of the church's denominational affilia-

tion? *If a church should make constitutional provision recognizing such practice, then if afterwards a majority should decide to withdraw from the Convention, there would be no violation of that which both factions had agreed to before the dissension.* It cannot be too strongly emphasized that some such action *must* be taken by the *churches* if their congregational independence is to be restored. In view of the legal precedent that has been set in North Carolina, for a church there *not* to take such action is for it to surrender its property to the virtual control of the Convention.

Ministers in Mecklenburg Association have declared themselves as favoring the adoption by our churches of such constitutional provisions which would insure to the local congregation sole ownership of the church property. They have requested that the General Board of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina approve the recommendation to our churches of such action.

In setting forth this new "Mecklenburg Declaration," these ministers have acted in accordance with the historic Mecklenburg insistence on independence from unjust authority, and in accordance with the historic Baptist insistence on independence from denominational authority. But, surely, North Carolina Baptists in general are no less insistent than Mecklenburg Baptists on holding to these ideals. And there is every reason to feel that Baptists everywhere in the "Old North State" are already beginning to be awakened from their Rip-Van-Winkle slumber, so that it may be said of them what was said of North Carolinians generally in a former crisis in their history:

Awhile, she seem'd, but seem'd to sleep;
She's wide awake, awake she'll keep,
The Old North State!
The Old North State!
Her famous Hornet's Nest is stirr'd,
The tocsin Mecklenburg has heard,
Old Rip has buckled on the sword,
Brave old North State!
Brave old North State!

The World Mission of the Church

BY ROBERT G. BRATCHER

"Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations."

Accustomed as we are to the words of this text, we are unable to read them with the real feeling of shock and surprise that should grip us as we consider the startling implications of these few words. Here were the eleven disciples on the mountain in Galilee to which Jesus had directed them: and as they met their resurrected Lord they instinctively worshipped him—but some doubted. Perhaps the text says not that *some* doubted, but that the eleven, all of them, even though they did worship the Lord, had doubts concerning the reality of what they saw.

The risen Lord of glory confronts these eleven weak, doubting men with his imperious claim and demand. Here, proleptically, is the Church: here God's power challenges man's weakness, God's wisdom meets man's folly, God's faithfulness confronts man's fickleness. From the lips of the risen Lord comes the imperative: "Make disciples of all nations." Impossible demand!

This demand, however, is supported by the prefixed "therefore." What precedes this "therefore," what causes it? The simple assertion: "All authority in heaven and upon earth is given me." Here is the indicative; and from it issues the imperative: "make disciples of all nations." First the indicative, then the imperative: that is the divine order.

I. The Basis

This, therefore, is the basis of the world mission of the Church: the all-encompassing authority of the risen Lord of glory. This is the only valid, only pertinent, only authoritative basis of our world mission: *the nature of the Lord of the Church.* It is not the threat of aggressive communism, nor the imminence of a third World War that make it imperative that we make disciples of all nations. It is not the threat of the A- or H- or C-bombs with their terrible de-

struction, that leads us as Christian witnesses to spread the gospel throughout the whole wide world; we are not to make disciples of all nations in order to save Western civilization or preserve the "American way of life." None of these is adequate as an enduring basis upon which to build a program that comprehends the whole world. "All authority is given me: *therefore* . . . ": this is the only sufficient basis. And it follows that whenever a church or a group of churches does not take to heart this imperative of our Lord's, there is an implicit denial of the indicative, an implicit denial of the fact that to Jesus, as risen Lord, was given all authority.

Where was it given? Should we tarry to answer that question several things could be said concerning that authority. Yet, very briefly, it would be agreed that this authority belongs to Jesus Christ as the Suffering Son of Man, as the expression in time and history of the sacrificial, atoning, redemptive love of God. Here is the power of God! Here is the authority of the risen Lord! It is the authority of Him who was willing to be bruised for our transgressions and beaten for our iniquities; the authority of the one who being in the form of God, emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, and was obedient unto death, even the death of a cross. For it was on account of this that God highly exalted him and gave him the name which is above every name, the name of LORD. It was thus that he entered into his glory: by suffering the things that he did (Luke 24:26).

So the Lord of glory confronted his weak, doubting disciples. And, as we read in another text, he promised them power that they might carry out his order: they were to remain in Jerusalem until they should clothe themselves with power from on high (Luke 24:49, Acts 1:8).

The power came, on the day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit descended and endued the Church with the power to carry out its world-wide mission. As we read the narrative of the book of the Acts and inquire into the nature of this power, we might be misled into thinking that the power

was in the tongues, or in the miracles, signs and wonders performed by the apostles and disciples. And, as some do, we might lament the fact that the Church no longer has that primitive, pristine power, and is insufficient today to carry out its appointed task with the same degree of success as the early Church.

But did the power reside in the tongues, miracles and wonders? Were they the very essence of the Spirit's power? They were rather the external manifestations, the visible trappings of the power of the Holy Spirit—but the real, inward power which God poured out upon his people that day, for all days, manifested itself in other ways.

1. It was the power of *Inspired Witnessing.* There was Simon Peter who a few weeks before had quailed and fled before the simple question of a maid-servant: now he stands up to the very men who had condemned his Lord to death and tells them that he could not but speak of the things that he had seen and heard (Acts 4:20). All of the apostles, as well, who had fled and forsaken their Lord in his hour of trial, now stoutly answer the Sanhedrin that they must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29). Here is the power of Pentecost! It is the power to witness even in the midst of adverse circumstances to the name of Jesus Christ. It was only with the enduement of this power (Acts 1:8) that the disciples could become, in fact, witnesses of Jesus Christ.

2. It was the power of a *Redeemed and Redeeming Community.* Here in the midst of a corrupt and divided society is created a new community, a fellowship, where all man-made differences disappear, where there is no longer Greek nor Jew, circumcised nor uncircumised, bond nor free—but only one people, one community in Christ (Gal. 3:28), whose only law is the law of love. Here is something new added to a jaded and cynical world; here is a fellowship that dares transcend the narrowness, the prejudices, the boundaries, the distinctions of race, culture and nationality of the society in which it is placed. No

wonder we read that it found favor with all the people (Acts 2:47)! Here was the power of Pentecost evidencing itself in the daily life of that redeemed and redeeming community.

When two vain and selfish individuals tried to use this community for their own selfish ends, tried to exploit it to their own advantage, *they* were carried out dead. So we understand when we read that none of the rest dared join himself to this group (Acts 5:12).

Has the Church today lost the power of Pentecost? Can it recapture it? Perhaps the Church has lost much of its power because it has ceased being a redeemed and redeeming community in the society in which it lives. Instead of manifesting its freedom and demonstrating its all-encompassing fellowship, transcending all narrow bonds of nationalism, culture and race, we are confronted today with the amazing spectacle of the Church of Jesus Christ as an institution which reflects, preserves and perpetuates the very patterns and mores, the very prejudices and divisions of the society in which it lives!

So long as the charge can be levelled against our churches that "the most rigidly segregated hour in all American life is the 11:00 o'clock hour of Sunday morning," so long will our churches be unable to make themselves felt as a power in society. No wonder the Church has lost its power! Instead of redeeming society from the limitations and prejudices which set a man against his fellowman, the Church, as an institution, has been governed and shaped by those very same prejudices!

The power of Pentecost was the power of a holy and divine purpose which informed this redeeming community, jealously preserving its sanctity against evil and vicious passions which would destroy its fellowship, mar its purity, and prostitute its holiness. Of what Southern Baptist church today could it be said that some would not dare join it?

Here was the power of a redeemed and redeeming community whose allegiance was to the Lord who had created it,

whose law was the law of love and whose passion was that of rescuing mankind from its lostness. With such power and authority the Church obeyed its Lord.

3. It was the power of *Sacrificial Devotion.* Here is Stephen as he prays, "Lord lay not this sin to their charge" (Acts 7:60), while stones rain down upon him. Which was the stronger? The stones, we might answer—for did they not cut short that prayer and crush the life out of him who uttered it? But we know better: the stronger was the prayer and the spirit which inspired it. Here was love, sacrificial, redemptive love, set against the hate and fury of men; here was a single candle of love lit in the whelming darkness of men's hates and prejudices. Darkness does not overcome light: and the prayer was stronger than the stones. For—who can doubt it?—that prayer was one of the goads God used to drive that stubborn, rebellious Pharisee named Saul into the path of service of the apostle Paul.

Here is power indeed: for it is fashioned out of the very stuff that was God's power incarnate in Jesus Christ of Nazareth. It is the power of Pentecost—the power which the Church needs today as it continues its relentless warfare against a world of hate, cruelty and inhumanity.

The world mission of the Church, therefore, is based upon the claim of our Lord: "all authority in heaven and on earth is given me." This same Lord of glory invests his community with power to enable it to carry out his command. The church which does not undertake the world mission which the Lord has given it implicitly denies this authority, and the power which he supplies.

II. The Scope

"Make disciples of all nations"—indicates succinctly the scope of the task. The Church is to become a World Church, its range universal, its fellowship catholic.

This did in fact take place. Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, was able to write:

> There is no people, Greek or Barbarian, or any other race, by whatsoever appellation or manner

> they may be distinguished, however ignorant of art and agriculture, whether they dwell in tents or wander about in covered wagons, among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered, in the name of the crucified Jesus, to the Father and creator of all things.

Tertullian, in the next century, was able to hurl at the pagans the justified taunt: "We are but of yesterday, and yet we already fill your cities, islands, camps, your palace, senate, forum. We have left you only your temples."

What have we today? Particularly, what is the situation in which we Southern Baptists find ourselves today with regard to the world mission of the Church? What we have in modern Protestantism, in which characteristic we Southern Baptists share, are strong national churches with a Foreign Missions department. As though the world task of the Church could be reduced to foreign missions! As though Southern Baptists were discharging their reponsibility by carrying on a program of Foreign Missions! The very concept of "foreign" missions is alien to the genius of the gospel, and its implementation a wholly inadequate expression of the world responsibility which lies upon Southern Baptists. Foreign Missions is decidely *not* the world mission of the Church.

This concept divides, segments, apportions and parcels out the field, which is the world, into different spheres of work and activity. Such divisions and spheres of influence are a contradiction of the universalism of the gospel. We have "local", "state", "home" and "foreign" missions: and as the distance increases our interest in and support of the work in these fields correspondingly decrease. This is not the world task of the Church! We as Southern Baptists dole out to "foreign" missions three cents out of every dollar we contribute to the Lord's work. We are just playing at the task of Foreign Missions when the Lord gave us a task whose scope is world-wide. What we are doing in "Foreign Missions" is a wholly inadequate substitute for the command we received to make disciples of all nations.

Why do we presume we can retain 97 cents out of every dollar for work here at home? On what basis are we to presume that the work within our Convention territory merits thirty times that which we give to "foreign" missions? When a whole world of hunger and need and lostness and death lies without the frontiers of our country how can we justify the miserly doling out of three cents of every dollar to that same world?

The scope of the mission is universal: and nothing in the New Testament can justify segmenting the one field into different fields and areas wherein geography determines our interest in and support of the work of the Lord.

III. The Responsibility

The responsibility for this task is indicated also in our text: "Make ye disciples of all nations." All of the disciples are included in the command—none is excepted. Our Lord does not suggest that the world task was the specific duty of only a few of them: he states explicitly that the responsibility belonged to all.

While the stories concerning the activities of the Eleven which have survived are no doubt overlaid with much that is legendary, still they present an impressive picture of the way in which the apostles took the Lord's command to heart, going to the uttermost parts of the earth.

What have we today, however? A sharp division in the ministry, with but a very few who go, indeed, unto "all nations". These few are "missionaries" or, better still, "foreign missionaries", a race set apart, a group of specialists, a select few, chosen, called and commissioned for that particular task, a "peculiar" and distinct breed of ministers, different from the rest.

Many, however, ask: aren't "foreign missionaries" ministers of God who have had a second, a special call? And doesn't Scripture itself justify this concept? Scripture is indeed used to justify this position—as for example Ephesians 4:11. Where we read that the ascended Lord appoint-

ed some as apostles, others as prophets, others as evangelists, others as pastors and teachers, the first classification—"apostles"—is made to mean "missionaries." The modern "missionary", however, is not to be equated with the New Testament apostles. Other than a common etymology (Latin and Greek) for the two words, today's missionary is no more an apostle than a Baptist State Secretary—or a Seminary professor!

That there are distinctions in gifts is everywhere recognized in the New Testament. These distinctions, however, are never geographical: they are spiritual. They are distinctions in abilities, dispositions, talents, and the over-all equipment with which the Holy Spirit furnishes God's ministers for the complete work of the ministry.

Is there, then, a special, a second call before a minister is enabled to go beyond the borders of his own homeland? That has been and still is the prevalent concept of the "missionary" call. But how true is that understanding to the New Testament concept of the all-powerful Lord entrusting to his followers a universal gospel to be taken to all nations?

Is a "special" call required? Is there a separate and (as some would judge it) a higher call? It would rather seem that the plain implications of a Lord who possesses all authority in heaven and on earth, of a command to make disciples of all nations, and of a message which is by its very nature universal, are that any and every man who is called by this Lord and charged with this task and preaches this message is thereby constituted, *by his very call*, a minister to the whole world, which is the field. He who called us is the Lord; the field to which he sends us is the world: and we have no right to segment, to divide that field into "local" "home" and "foreign" fields. As a matter of mere convenience it is perhaps right and inevitable: but when this nomenclature of "local" "home" and "foreign" fields penetrates into and dominates our very concept of the ministry and of the call to preach, it has become something

completely foreign to the spirit and plain message of the New Testament.

All servants of Christ, all ministers of the Gospel, are potentially "foreign" missionaries. Their call is to preach to the whole world, and a called man cannot claim to be fully surrendered to this universal Lord until he has considered the world which lies outside of his country to have as equal a claim upon his ministry as the country in which he was born. We, Southern Baptist preachers today, are commanded by the Lord to be his witnesses unto all peoples, to make disciples of all nations, to go into all the world. His commands are for us, for our day and time. (Or is it necessary to fight, anew, the battle that William Carey fought?)

How dare we insist upon a separate "call" to a "foreign" field when the explicit command of the Master to all his servants is that they evangelize the whole world?

Why have we not obeyed? That we have not is plainly evident. In 109 years of overseas work Southern Baptists have sent out only 1960 missionaries—an average of less than twenty per year. At the present time Southern Baptists have only 332 ordained ministers overseas while close to 24,000 of them are in the homeland.

One hundred and five years ago J. Lewis Shuck, Southern Baptist missionary to China, wrote the following:

> By what daring exegesis can the last command of the Son of God be so interpreted as to make it consistent for 3,000 Baptist preachers to cluster together in the Southern states . . . and only eight of these men go to the 333,000,000 immortal souls in China? Must we tell the Chinese . . . that "every creature" has no reference to the yellow peoples of the earth, but that the phrase "all the world" signifies a favored country already evangelized, and that the command "Go" really means to stay at home?

Daring exegesis indeed! Why this disparity? Why this glaring disproportion? Is it the work and the will of the Holy Spirit? Are we to attribute to Him this failure to take

seriously the command of the Lord that we make disciples of all nations? Consciously or unconsciously that is exactly what we affirm: for there is not one Southern Baptist preacher who would not say with all sincerity that he is where the Lord wants him to be, doing what the Lord wants him to do. Yes, that is our answer: is it, however, the true answer?

It would not seem so: it would seem rather inconsistent, to say the least, that the Holy Spirit would in such a poor fashion implement our Lord's command as to call out to foreign missionary work less than 2% of all Southern Baptist ministers. I would like to consider with you, therefore, very briefly, three reasons why Southern Baptists have not obeyed to the fullest their Lord's command.

1. *Provincialism.* We just take it for granted, in our provincialism, that when called as ministers of the Gospel we are to remain in the Southland unless and until another "call" come. Why do you take that for granted? Why do you presume that when called you were called to serve white Baptists in the southern part of the United States? Why do you presume that for any other type of ministry you need another "call"? Were you called as a minister of (white) Southern Baptists or were you called as minister of Christ? The two should be, in fact, synonymous—but sometimes they are not.

During my six years as a student on this campus it was my privilege to speak to several fellow students about the possibility of foreign mission work. Invariably all manifested their interest and expressed their willingness to do that kind of work: "I'm willing to go if I'm called!" That was their answer: "I'm not going because I haven't been called!"

That is not, however, the answer I should have gotten. I should have been told: "I'm not going to the foreign mission field because I have been called to the Southland." But I never got *that* answer.

It is pure and simple provincialism on our part to suppose that unless a special call comes our way our ministry is to be confined to the national, cultural and geographical environment in which we were born.

2. *Prejudice.* This is an ugly word, and I use it cautiously, though advisedly. If wrong, I am sure you will correct me. Is prejudice, a judgment before knowledge of the facts, a factor in our failure as Southern Baptist ministers to go out as missionaries as we should?

Do you harbor prejudice against the missionary calling and ministry? That there *is* prejudice among us is undeniable. There are those who look upon the missionary calling as a second-best, a ministry into which go those who are not capable of filling a "regular" ministry. Yes, it exists: what I am asking is, "Does it exist in you?"

When a young man who feels inclined to do foreign missionary work is told by his parents that he is fitted for something better than *that*—I know prejudice exists. When a minister's wife says of her husband that she hopes he never considers foreign missionary work because he is such a talented, capable man—I know there is prejudice. Do you share any of it? Do you look upon our missionary boards as a refuge for those who are not equal to the task of pastoring churches in the Southland?

3. *Professionalism.* This is the third basic reason, it seems to me, why we have so few Southern Baptist ministers overseas. In any institutionalized expression of religion some degree of professionalism is inevitable. In itself the distinction between clergy and laity is a result of this institutionalism and a reflection of this professionalism.

In no way, however, can that tendency condone or excuse the amount of professionalism that exists in our ministry. When the ministry ceases to be a vocation, a God-given vocation, and becomes a profession, all the standards whereby men judge a profession are applied to the ministry. Consequently a minister—specifically, a pastor—is judged to be successful upon the basis of recognition, influence, prestige and salary.

Such being the standards by which one's ministry is considered successful, and such being our real weakness, as ministers, in conforming to these patterns and standards, it follows that foreign mission work would appeal to very few. This is not to say that there are no professionals on the foreign fields: it is to say that foreign mission work has no appeal to make to men who consider their calling a profession.

Who is the successful minister? It is he who moves steadily to larger pastorates or denominational jobs of greater influence and affluence. Underlying our thinking in this Seminary and the Convention itself is the presupposition that the goal and ultimate end of a successful pastor is the pastorate of a large city church. So easily do we succumb to worldly standards of success! And am I completely wrong in suggesting that perhaps there have been men who have taken their Th.D. degree in this Seminary because it proves a definite and valuable asset to them in their professional career as ministers in the Southern Baptist Convention?

Is it necessary that you be reminded again that such is not the New Testament pattern? No amount of rationalization to the effect that such "promotions" in the career of pastors mean only greater opportunity for service can beguile the fact that the infection of professionalism is a virulent one indeed and in some form or the other touches practically all of us.

What is the answer? In view of these factors and the ruinous effect they exercise upon our willingness to take our Lord seriously and make disciples of all nations, what are we to do? It would seem incumbent upon each of us that he examine himself to see what part provincialism, prejudice and professionalism play in his concept of the Christian ministry, and examine his concept in the light of our Lord's command to take the gospel to all the world.

I am not appealing to you, as ministers of Christ, to a greater consecration — as though greater consecration

would automatically result in a larger number of missionaries, or as though a missionary, per se, were more consecrated to his Lord than the stateside pastor. I hope that all of you are more dedicated to the Lord's will than this poor missionary who speaks to you this morning.

What I am appealing for is that you analyze dispassionately, objectively and prayerfully your concept of the gospel which you preach, of the Lord whose you are, of the field in which you serve, and of the ministry to which you have been called. And in the light of this analysis, I appeal that you lay yourself open to all its consequences, without doging, without rationalizing, and take the appropriate action these consequences demand.

Book Reviews

Church and State in Luther and Calvin. By William A. Mueller. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954. 183 pages. $2.50.

William A. Mueller is our own Professor of Philosophy of Religion here at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The subject of his book is highly important, and to its exposition he brings knowledge based on wide reading in Reformation sources. A valuable part of the book also is the survey of modern literature on the subject of church and state in Reformation thought. Since most of this material is in German and French, readers of English only get double value.

Part One, Luther's View of Church and State, deals with the Reformer's conceptions of the church (*Gemeinde*) and secular authority (*Obrigkeit*); and with the problems Natural Law and Religious Liberty. These are all difficult subjects in themselves. Further, they are subjects on which Luther himself did not speak with uniform consistency. This makes the interpreter's job more difficult. Professor Mueller, weighing the evidence with caution, concludes that (1) Luther had a clear insight into the hidden character and spiritual nature of the Church, but was unable to realize the high ideal in actual practice; (2) the Reformer's earlier understanding of the limitations on secular rulers was in part rendered nugatory by admitting to them direct power from God on the basis of their being Christian princes. On the question of whether the Lutheran social and political ethic is essentially quietistic, the reviewer recommends a study of George Forell, *Faith Active in Love,* New York: American Press, 1954.

Part Two, Calvin's View of Church and State, is somewhat more amply treated than the section on Luther. None has had a sense of higher churchmanship than Calvin, and he was able to secure and direct a Reformed movement on an international front. The Church as "the society of the faithful whom God has predestined unto eternal life," is invisible. This church diffused throughout the earth is one body, not many, and lives under one head. Yet it is a visible church of congregating believers (whose election is not always discernible with the eyes). The proper signs (*notae*) of the church are: doctrine, discipline, sacraments, and useful ceremonies.

The state, never an autonomous entity, but always equally subject with the church to the sovereign rule of God, exists to protect and enhance the church. While Calvin himself felt no commitment

to any one form of government (aristocratic, democratic, etc.), it is to be concluded that his insistence upon limited sovereignty and government under law "provided the potential basis for the elaboration of democratic ideas." Rejecting egalitarianism, Calvin favored a sort of representative democracy which might be called "aristocracy tempered with democracy." Dr. Mueller, like Calvin, recognizes that *all* human institutions are subject to corruption and so are under God's judgment. This means that perversions of truth are possible even in a free and democratic society.

This study will serve both as a useful historical survey of the problems of church and state in reformation thought, and as a helpful introduction to the same issues in our own time. It is easy to wish for too much, but one wishes for a section on Anabaptist views of church and state, and for a short interpretation of the American tradition on the same subject.

Broadman Press is to be commended for this venture into publication at a higher level and on more serious subjects. The book is attractively manufactured, has good bibliography and index, and deserves serious study on the part of our pastors and people. The reviewer hopes that this is but an earnest of similar publication both from Broadman and from Dr. Mueller.

T. D. Price

Religious Factors in Mental Illness. By Wayne E. Oates. New York: Association Press, 1955. 240 pages. $3.50.

With eager anticipation students and colleagues of Dr. Oates have awaited this volume, which is the "book of the month" selection of Pastoral Psychology Club for May. To say that it fulfills every expectation is to express the reviewer's opinion mildly. Already books by the author have gained national recognition; this one will undoubtedly add to his prestige as an authority in the field.

Problems of mental health have been discussed voluminously by psychologists and physicians, most of whom had scant acquaintance with the Bible and its interpretation. Likewise a vast literature is available from men who knew the Bible and Christian doctrine but were only slightly acquainted with the problems of mental health. Dr. Oates has rendered distinctive service in that he combines masterful knowledge of both fields and has succeeded in bringing each to the service of the other.

Attacking boldly the assumption that people "go crazy over religion," the author deals realistically with the relation between types of religious experience and types of neurotic behavior. He shows on the one hand that religion may be a hindrance to mental health or on the other hand that it may be a factor in producing

and maintaining mental health. In true scientific spirit, he adduces conclusions from clinical data, arriving inductively at distinctions between healthy and unhealthy religion. Types of religious experience are described as arising from inter-personal relations, such as the religion of hostility, dependent religion, despairing religion, withdrawal and blighted religious experience. Turning from these negative aspects, the author discusses positively and constructively the role of religion in the therapy of mental illness. He shows how religion functions at the point of diagnosis, at the point of referral, and in the process of treatment of mental disturbances.

Perhaps the most vigorous and disturbing chapter is that which deals with the psychiatrist's approach to the religious experience of mentally ill patients. With almost devastating frankness the author challenges certain psychiatric approaches which ignore religion, repudiate religion, or substitute psychoanalysis for religious experience. He makes the case solidly for the right of the Christian minister to a place on "the healing team." The final chapter is intensely practical, spelling out the therapeutic problems involved in the religion of the mentally ill and pointing to the necessity and the value of partnership between the minister as a religious specialist and the psychiatrist as a medical specialist.

This book marks a milestone in the progress of pastoral care as an applied science. It should quickly find its way to the desk of every pastor and of many a doctor of medicine.

G. S. Dobbins

In This Name. By Claude Welch. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 313 pages. $3.50.

Conservatives and liberals alike will flick from the cutting criticisms of this profound and penetrating volume. It is no doubt the best one volume to read on the doctrine of the Trinity, and one can only hope that American theology is headed in the direction of this discussion. The great mass of material and the number of writers mentioned may leave the casual reader unable to see the wood for the trees, but a critical and careful reading of the book will constantly confront the two issues summarized in Appendix A and Appendix B. In fact, the beginner should master the last ten pages of the book before he attempts to read the rest! And the reviewer has read the rest!

Appendix A distinguishes the "economic" and "immanent" ideas of the Trinity, a point of crucial importance for Tertullian and for all discussions since. No true doctrine of the Trinity is possible if faith does not move from historical revelation to eternal essence, and from eternal essence to eternal relations. The God of eternity must

be the same as the God of history both in nature and relations or we have no revelation of God at all.

Appendix B is concerned with the social analogy of the Trinity especially as elaborated in the theology of Leonard Hodgson of Oxford. At this point the reviewer is more patient with British theology than the more Barthian author of this book. At another point, i.e. the question whether the Trinity is the *arche* or the apex of the Christian doctrine of God, I think Barthianism runs into ontological abstraction. To be sure the Trinity is the *arche* of ontology, but it seems more correct to say it is the apex of historical revelation. At this point as in the question of the immanent Trinity our feet must be firmly planted in the mighty act of God in history.

Dale Moody

Oral Tradition (Studies in Biblical Theology—II). By Eduard Nielsen. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1954. 108 pages. $1.25.

This book forms a valuable introduction to the new emphasis on oral tradition which characterizes the Scandinavian School of Old Testament Studies. So far the information on this new discipline has not been easily available because it is written in the Scandinavian languages. In this monograph, Mr. Nielsen endeavors to give an introduction to it.

This monograph takes a radical approach, and on the basis of the tradition-historical method seeks to show how specific Old Testament texts may be dealt with. In view of the highly developed forms of language in Canaan when the Hebrews entered the land, the reviewer is by no means convinced that oral transmission performed the all-embracing function which this school of thinkers suggests. The Court Chronicles of David is only one instance, immediately arising to the mind, of probable early written material. The prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, too, committed at least part of their message to writing. The truth will probably be between the two extremes—traditions were preserved in both oral and written form.

We can be grateful for those scholars who, as shown in this monograph, have investigated the forms and validity of oral transmission in the Near East and so legitimatized the place of oral tradition in any consideration of our Biblical records. It is by no means clear that the result of a wholesale movement to this approach alone is all gain, and the final position will probably rest in the recognition that oral and written modes were blended in the formation and transmission of the Pentateuchal, historical and prophetic traditions of our Old Testament.

One virtue of this monograph is that Nielsen does apply the new method of investigation to three specific passages—Jeremiah 36, Micah 4-6, and the Flood Story in Genesis.

E. C. Rust

A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series. Under the editorial supervision of Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Volume VII: **S. Cyril of Jerusalem; S. Gregory Nazianzen.** Volume VIII: **St. Basil: Letters and Select Works.** Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955. 498 and 363 pages respectively. $6.00 per volume.

By all odds the finest patristic set in the English language when these volumes came out a generation ago, they are still of great value and not wholly displaced by later series.

In Volume VII, we have the catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem which state for candidates for membership in the Church, the gist of the Christian faith. These lectures are concluded with five highly important ones on the sacraments, delivered to the newly baptized. These date from A.D. 348.

From Gregory Nazianzen we have some of the more important of his *Orations* (including the *theological*), and select letters. The former make major contribution to the discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity, while the latter throw much interesting light on the fourth century history of the church in the East.

Volume VIII, St. Basil, contains the famous treatise on the Holy Spirit, the nine homilies on Genesis narrative of creation (the *Hexaemeron*), and over three hundred letters.

Volumes of this type, carefully studied, are of incalculable worth. Mastery of some of these would make us much less dependent on other expository efforts.

T. D. Price

A New Critique of Theoretical Thought. Vol. I, The Necessary Presuppositions of Philosophy. By Herman Dooyeweerd, trans. by D. H. Freeman and W. S. Young. Phildelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1953. 566 pages. Price of four volume set, $30.00.

One finishes this volume with mixed feelings. At points it is acute and satisfying, and yet it seems out of touch with modern works in its expression. Its author is Professor of Philosophy of Law at the Free University of Amsterdam, and he appears to have exerted wide influence in the somewhat narrow circles of Reformed Theology in Holland. One doubts, however, whether he has much contribution to offer to the forward and progressive evangelical thinking of our time. Here Karl Heim, reviewed elsewhere in these pages, has much more to give.

Dooyeweerd is rightly concerned to attack the philosophical tradition since the Renaissance, which he aptly describes as humanistic immanence philosophy. His analysis of the great philosophical systems of the past three centuries is often pointed and valuable, as

for example his treatment of Kant, Fichte, and Hegel. He attacks the tradition on the ground that it presupposes the self-sufficiency of the transcendental -logical subject of thought, and he holds that the enthronement of the ego must be replaced by the religious act of confrontation with the Ground of Being, God. He argues that the cleft between faith and thought is actually a false one, resulting from the ego-centric philosophy of the modern period, and here he is one with many modern thinkers who are recovering the Biblical and Augustinian approach in our time. Thought must have a religious root, and true philosophical thinking is possible when we have a transcendental starting point, not in our own self-sufficient reason, but in God who is the ground of all reason. Here the author turns to Calvin and seeks to elaborate a philosophy of law. He holds that the cosmonomic idea of Calvin is the clue to a truly Christian philosophy, and unfortunately seems at this point to tie himself to the legalism of the Biblical Word, whereas so much Christian Existentialism and neo-Augustinianism is emphasizing the encounter with Christ as the living, creative, redemptive and cosmic Word of God. The result is a somewhat wooden scheme of philosophy compared with the vital contributions of thinkers like Gabriel Marcel and Karl Heim.

We could wish that the literary style and mode of presentation of this work, for which incidentally the author tentatively seems to apologize in his foreword, were more attractive. This book is hard going, and it does not gear in too easily with the streams of thought which are taking hold in theological circles under existentialist influence.

E. C. Rust

The Library of Christian Classics. Volume II: **Alexandrian Christianity.** Edited by J. E. L. Oulton and Henry Chadwick, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 475 pages. $5.00. Volume XI: **Nature and Grace.** Translated and Edited by A. M. Fairweather. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 386 pages. $5.00.

With the addition of these two volumes of the *Library of Christian Classics* eight volumes of a scheduled twenty-six are available.

Alexandrian Christianity gives us writings from Clement and Origin. From the former's famous *Miscellanies*, we have the treatise *On Marriage* (from Bk. III), and *On Spiritual Perfection* (Bk. VII). In his discussion of Marriage, Clement moves between the two extremes of asceticism and license. The treatise on Perfection shows how the maturest stage of Christian life calls for moving upward beyond faith to knowledge. This is the true Gnosis.

From Origen we have his exposition of the Lord's Prayer, the

Exhortation to Martyrdom, and the recently (1914) discovered *Dialogue with Heraclides.*

Essays of general introduction precede the writings of each author. Select bibliographies and indexes add to the value of the book for serious students. The Alexandrian school is a bright chapter in the history of Christian thought, to which this volume may serve as an excellent introduction.

The volume *Nature and Grace* is composed of five selections from the theological *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. This most important of theologians for Roman Catholicism has, of all her sons, given the fullest, if unfinished, statement of the Church's faith.

These five sections deal with the nature of sacred doctrine, the existence and character of God, sin, Grace and merit, and the theological virtues: faith, hope, charity. An analysis of these sections is given in Fairweather's general introduction.

These are books to buy and study.

T. D. Price

The Transformation of the Scientific World View. By Karl Heim. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. 262 pages. $3.50.

This book is complementary to the one already reviewed in these columns and entitled *The Christian Faith and Natural Science.* Its author is one of the most distinguished and influential German theologians of this century, and his influence on modern thinking can be gauged by the number of books which echo his ideas—H. H. Farmer of Cambridge and John Oldham are two Anglo-Saxon thinkers who reveal this impact. Here, in America, his position and significance as a Christian Apologist are being increasingly recognized, and the English translation of these two volumes is to be heartily welcomed.

In the book under review, Professor Heim examines the new outlook of science and shows how it is becoming increasingly incompatible with materialism. He shows how the theory of relativity on the large scale and quantum mechanics on the small scale have dislodged from its throne the idea of an absolute object and pushed us back on the basic issue of energy and activity. Natural phenomena are no longer describable in the neat pictures of mechanical models. Wave and particle pictures of atomic particles both have their own importance, and we are left with patterned activities whose exact nature eludes us. Energy cannot be objectified. So also absolute time and space have disappeared, and the significance of the point of view of the observer enters the scientific order. Relativity has entered the picture, and we find in these pages some excellent illustrations of what it means. Finally absolute determin-

ism and causation have given way to probability, indeterminism and statistical averages. We can no longer say that scientific law is absolute, but only that it describes the probable behaviour of nature. This section is well written and particularly lucid.

All this means that the absolute principles, on which science hitherto has relied and which have made a materialistic outlook easy, are being jettisoned. A search for new absolutes is essential. We have to adopt a new approach to the universe. Experimental observation and not religion have forced this on us, but religious faith can welcome the new position with open arms. Heim holds that the collapse of the self-imposed constructions of the human mind is but a negative preparation for a final acknowledgment of the sole Absolute, the Creator, who stands behind all our systems. He alone is our eternal point of rest.

Heim proceeds to point up his contention that the way of objectification does not hold the key to ultimate reality. The failure of our self-constructed absolutes, especially in the realm of causation, points to the direct dependence of all nature upon the Creator. Heim thus contends, in conformance with the Biblical viewpoint, that we must not discriminate between nature and supernature. Nature is itself supernatural or miraculous and miracle is not a suspension of natural law but an extraordinary divine activity within the aegis of God's normal and habitual creative work. God does not intervene for miracle but simply alters his habitual activity. This section is very valuable and truly Biblical.

The last section of the book passes into the realm of biology. Heim believes that life is not something added to organisms but the principle of wholeness which organizes energy at the level of living things. He thus attacks both mechanists and vitalists and comes out on the side of the holistic viewpoint emphasized by thinkers like Smuts. Here we see a neo-Aristotelian emphasis which is very welcome. Every organic structure is seeking to build itself up in accord with its distinctive principle of wholeness. The principle itself, like energy and the ego, is non-objectifiable and thus eludes scientific investigation. We can study the results of its activity, but by the objective methods of science we cannot reach it.

On every hand, objectifying methods reach an impasse. They cannot explore the deeps of being, and just here faith in God has the answer. This is a great book. If our ministers want to meet the needs of thinking laymen and also to have some answer themselves for this scientific age, they should possess and read it. We hope to review in the next issue, the sequel, as yet untranslated from the German, in which Karl Heim deals with "World Creation and World End."

E. C. Rust

Luther's Theologia Crucis. By Walther von Loewenich. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1954 (4th edition). 248 pages. DM 12.00.

This book by the Erlangen scholar appeared first in 1929 and now, in answer to the clamor of interested students, appears again without any serious changes. However, the postscript (pp. 240-248) supplies additional textual-critical data on the basis of Luther research since 1929. The author's own "Zehn Jahre Lutherforschung" in *Theologie und Liturgie,* 1952, 119-179 has summarized much of this important research for the judicious student. While in the earlier editions, Loewenich could rightly state that most of the older Luther scholars like Theodosius Harnack, Köstlin, Bauer, Braun, and particularly Otto Ritschl, failed to do justice to Luther's theology of the cross, he now is convinced that men like Elert, Erich Seeberg, Joh. von Walter, Otto Scheel, Hanns Lilje as well as Ernst Wolf, have reemphasized the significance of this *theologia crucis* in Luther's thought about both God and the nature of Christian faith.

Moreover, Loewenich admits that at two points he has been compelled to revise his former findings, first, *re* the question of the *Deus absconditus* in Luther's controversy with Erasmus, and secondly, in his all too sharp antithesis of New Testament faith and mystical piety. Tauler's mysticism is not necessarily governed by a *theologia gloriae.* Despite the mystic's yearning for ecstasy, he may yet live in faith and under grace. Likewise Luther's Christ mysticism is not as far removed from that of Tauler's as Loewenich formerly assumed. In recent essays on Meister Eckhardt and Bernhard of Clairvaux and in his book on Paul (Witten, 1949[2]) Loewenich has crystallized a deeper understanding of mystical piety. In his "Luther und das Johanneische Christentum" (Munich: 1935) and "Luther als Ausleger der Synoptiker (Ib., 1954) Loewenich has tried to show whether or not Luther really presented the whole range of biblical truth in his *theologia crucis.*

This reviewer is in substantial agreement with Loewenich's thesis that Luther's *theologia crucis* is not merely a pre-reformatory state of Luther's thinking (as Otto Ritschl imagined), but the very heart and essence of Luther's theology. Tracing the roots of Luther's theology of the cross through the Reformer's writings, from the Heidelberg disputation of 1518, the Isaiah lectures of 1727-30, to the commentary on Genesis, 1535-1545, and that on Galatians, 1531-35, Loewenich comes to this conclusion:

1. Luther was a theologian of revelation. Insight into God's will and purpose for salvation does not come through nature or the created order, but alone through Jesus Christ, our crucified Lord.

2. This revelation is not a direct but an indirect revelation.

3. Concretely, we know God not *ex operibus* (from his works), but *per passiones et crucem,* i.e., through sufferings and the Cross.

While Romans 1:20 admits of the *possibility* of men knowing God through his works, in *actuality* men have utterly failed thus to know God. The Cross of Christ implies the judgment of God against both moralism and rationalism. Man can neither save himself through his moral efforts nor by his rational speculations. The Cross of Christ means humiliation, abnegation, death both to Christ, our sin-bearer and redeemer, and to the believer.

4. God's *visibilia* are hidden under the guise of Christ's humanity, infirmity, and foolishness. At the very place where all lights seem to be blacked out, faith sees the glory of God's grace in Christ Jesus. A theology of revelation points to God who reveals himself by hiding himself in Christ. (Col. 3:1-4).

William A. Mueller

Nature, Mind and Modern Science. By Errol S. Harris. London: Allen and Unwin, 1954. xvi, 455 pages. 35s.

The author of this book is Professor of Philosophy in the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa. He has given us a timely and valuable study upon the relation of science and religion, and shows real capacity as a historian of philosophy.

In a masterly survey our author takes us through the various views of the interrelationship of mind and matter held in the Greek period and by the thinkers of the Renaissance. Professor Harris discusses skillfully the breakdown of empiricism in the critique of Hume and so brings us to the threshold of the modern period in the thought of Kant. His discussion of the precursors of the modern outlook leads to a valuable treatment of modern empiricism. The latter ends in a particularly useful chapter on Logical Positivism.

It is Professor Harris' contention that philosophy and science may no longer be kept apart as they were from the Renaissance onwards. Science is becoming philosophical and modern philosophy is becoming increasingly concerned with the sciences. He shows this in the last section of the book. Having disposed of the logical positivists, he considers the revolution in modern science and the scientific cosmologies of Bergson, Lloyd Morgan, Samuel Alexander, and A. N. Whitehead. His sympathies quite clearly lie on the side of idealism, and he argues all through his book that the failure of the empiricists and realists lies always in their rejection of the values for which idealism stands. (He agrees that idealism too has to be cleansed from its defects.) Mind is the ground of reality. It is implicit or immanent throughout the evolutionary process in that from which human mind finally emerges. Indeed, there can be nothing in nature which is wholly devoid of mind, and the modern scientific understanding of nature as fundamentally activity supports this contention.

There is a flavor of pantheism or monism about Harris' contention that the future philosophy of nature and of history will be that of the self-knowledge and self-development of mind. His idealistic position and his obvious sympathy with his teacher, R. G. Collingwood, would lead us to expect this. His is an evolutionary and holistic form of monism, but he has many acute criticisms and analyses to offer, and his historical and contemporary studies make this book invaluable for any student. The reviewer intends to make it required reading in his own course on Faith and Nature. In no other single volume, apart from Collingwood's *Idea of Nature*, is so much valuable philosophical material about mind and nature gathered together and critically sifted.

Professor Harris believes that science and religion need no longer be severed. God and nature belong together, and the existence of God is the absolute and most indispensable presupposition of science. The Logical Positivists are coldly dismissed with the parting shot that "empiricism, though it persists, is a relic of the past without scientific basis, and has itself proved to be, in this age of evolution, relativity and quanta, an outworn and outmoded superstition."

E. C. Rust

A History of Russian Philosophy. By V. V. Zenkovsky. Translated from the Russian by George L. Kline. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953. 2 volumes. 947 pages. $15.00.

This is a most significant work in the field of Russian philosophy. Few people outside the experts have any idea of the range and depth of Russian philosophy, both secular and religious. In fact, a good case could be made for the thesis that in no European country has philosophy "remained at all times connected with *its own* religious elementality, its own religious soil" (1:2). Professor Zenkovsky has laid us all under his debt in producing this massive work and the translator deserves highest credit for making it available in such an excellent translation.

What have been some of the driving forces in Russian philosophy in recent centuries? First, its deep involvement in Russian religiosity. The latter points to Orthodoxy as the fountain head of Russian piety. But was not Russian Christianity from the start excessively ascetic and otherworldly? Zenkovsky demurs and points to the immense joy of the Easter festival in Orthodox religion. "A perception of the world in the light of the Easter experience lies at the very centre of the Russian religious consciousness; apart from this it cannot be understood" (1:26).

Contrary to the West where epistemology has dominated philosophical discussion, Russia has been more concerned with ontologism.

Within the latter "the theme of man, his fate and career, the meaning and purpose of history" have been uppermost in the minds of Russian thinkers. With it has been linked an intense interest in social problem in the context of historiosopical considerations. Significantly, the Russian word *pravda* means both truth and justice, hence the search for wholeness, for maximalism often aborting into utopianism, that is, seeing a fusion of the material and spiritual where it actually did not exist (Holy Russia, the Tsar as a sacred entity, Moscow—the Third Rome.) The all or nothing maximalism of Russian piety and philosophy accounts for much of the radicalism and even anarchism of Russian faith and practice. This also explains, in part at least, the terrific extremes which have characterized the life of Russia, most ancient and modern, that is, patriarchal despotism in government and moral anarchism among the people, the cult of passive virtues and explosive revolt. Nor dare we forget the effect on the Russian mind of the infinite horizons of the Russian steppes, the blending of Slavic, Finnish, Turkish, and Mongolian bloodstrains. The place of the peasant as the bearer of the nation's purest soul, the idea of the *mir*, a land community with half collectivist forms of ownership, four centuries of empire, during which basic social needs were sacrificed to the military state, the restlessness and rupture of Russian thinking since the invasion of Western ideas in the 18th century, all these have been significant factors in shaping Russia's outlook and tragic destiny. The *Raskol* or schism both endangered and enriched the Russian soul. The break between the upper and lower classes also bore strange fruit. Which country, we ask, has experienced such deep inner and outer upheavals as has Russia since Peter the Great?

To grapple with the thought of Lomosov (1711-65), Radishecev (1749-1802), Speranski (1772-1834), Prince Odoyevski (1803-69), P. Y. Chaadayev (1794-1856), A. S. Khomyakov (1804-60), N. V. Gogol (1809-52), the Hegelians Stankevich, Bakunin and Belinski, with Leontyev and Rosanov, or the seminal thinker Vladimir S. Solovyov (1853-1900), is indeed a challenging and fruitful undertaking.

William A. Mueller

Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach. By Walter Marshall Horton. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955. 304 pages. $3.75.

It is no surprise to find that Walter Marshall Horton has produced a popular guide to ecumenical theology that is both balanced and clear. One of the most lucid religious writers in America, he has produced another "report" which will be of great value to those who

are unable "to listen" to all the conversations of ecumenical discussions.

After an introduction of definitions and procedures, several major topics are surveyed as a problem, followed by the Christian concensus on the problem, and concluding with a frank and fair statement of the unresolved issues. The topics cover the main divisions of Christian thought, so that the result is both systematic theology and a statement of the status of the present effort at unity and understanding.

Readers who confine their reading to that which is "approved" within their denomination need most to read this systematic survey. Even those who have habits of greater curiosity will profit from the perspective and penetration of this refreshing review.

Dale Moody

Theologie des Alten Testaments. By Ludwig Köhler. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953. xi, 254 pages. DM 13.

We welcome this new edition of what has come to be the best *one volume* theology of the Old Testament in German, French or English. Dr. Köhler's book has been in service too long to attempt any critique. This new edition is not substantially different from its precursor. It retains the somewhat traditional systematic framework in which Köhler's treatment is developed—God, Man, Judgment and Salvation. We are surprised to find no references to the valuable contributions of Dr. A. R. Johnson, all published since the first edition. Surprisingly, too, no reference is made to the many and varied contributions of Mowinckel and other Scandinavian scholars. We note that Köhler still retains the somewhat liberal antithesis between the prophetic message and sacrifice and fails to think of sacrifice as more than attempts at human self-redemption. Here, too, he is beginning to be dated in his outlook. The book, however, retains its usefulness, even though it now needs supplementing at points. No Old Testament student can afford to be without it.

E. C. Rust

War, Communism and World Religions. By Charles S. Braden. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. 281 pages. $3.50.

Professor Charles S. Braden of Northwestern University has long been recognized as a first-rate student of world religions. His interest has centered typically, not so much on ancient forms and traditions, but upon contemporary developments in religions. With the rise of Communism, and the increasing realization that it tended

to come into conflict with religion at certain points, it was not surprising that Braden should undertake an investigation of the nature and extent of influence of Communism upon the historic faiths of the world. In a seven months' trip around the world in 1952, he sought an answer to this question, along with an inquiry into the effects of the Second World War upon religions.

No brief summary of the findings of such an extensive tour is possible. Variety and change are keynotes of contemporary religion. One must read Braden to sense the bewildering variety encountered in concrete situations. With reference to the key question, whether religion can be counted upon as a bulwark against Communistic advance in Asia, Braden's findings are not reassuring. Even Islam cannot be counted upon as an absolute barrier to Communist propaganda.

The book closes with a chapter on "War, Communism and Christianity," incorporating a statement formulated by the faculty of Garrett Biblical Institute. The over-all message of the study is one of warning concerning the extensiveness of world Communism and its pervasive effects even upon ancient systems of tradition. This is Comparative Religion brought up-to-date.

H. C. Goerner

Das Buch Hiob (2nd Edition). By Gustav Hölscher. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952. 102 pages. DM 7.00.

We welcome this new edition of an already established commentary on the Book of Job. First published in 1937, it has now been revised in the text and brought up-to-date in the bibliography. Hölscher still maintains his fundamental critical position. He would dismiss the descriptions of the ostrich, hippopotamus and crocodile in the divine speeches as additions, and thinks that these descriptions really break up into two what was originally only one speech of Yahweh. On the whole, Hölscher is no radical critic. He accepts as original all three cycles of dialogue between Job and his friends, but thinks with most scholars that elements of the third cycle have been displaced. Further, he will have nothing to do with any suggestion that the prose framework existed prior to the poetic dialogue, and holds that the author of the poetry was responsible also for the prose prologue and epilogue (employing, for this, traditional material available to him). All this is a reminder that the days of radical criticism for its own sake are passing from us, and that we are moving into an era of Biblical study when criticism is at best but an instrument for discovering what the Word of God has to say to men. Those who read German should have this commentary on their shelves.

E. C. Rust

The Virgin Birth of Christ. By Howard A. Hanke. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Comany, 1953. 52 pages. $0.60.

For those who assume the author's view of the supernatural and the Scriptures, the conclusions reached will be of some value; but for the student confronted by naturalistic philosophy and the rejection of biblical authority it will be necessary to penetrate more deeply into textual and theological problems. The reviewer would join the author in the defense of the Miraculous Conception and Virgin Birth of our Lord, but he would most definitely abandon some of the specious arguments that go back to Justin Martyr and Origen. The historical study of Scripture modifies considerably the interpretation of such passages as Genesis 3:15; Isaiah 7:14, Jeremiah 31:22b, and Micah 5:2, but the problem of how the eternal Son of God took on flesh and blood is not answered satisfactorily apart from the miracle of the incarnation (p. 15).

Dale Moody

Verheissung und Erfullung (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments)—6. By W. G. Kummel. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag. 2nd Edition, 1953. 156 pages. Sw. Fr. 15.60.

We welcome this new edition of a valuable monograph on New Testament theology. Kummel here undertakes an examination of the significance of our Lord's teaching on the Kingdom, and disagrees with both the realized eschatologists like Dood and Bultmann and the futuristic eschatologists like J. Weiss and Schweitzer. He argues cogently that both realized and futuristic elements are contained in the teaching of our Lord and thus stands alongside of New Testament scholars like T. W. Manson and Oscar Cullmann. He emphasizes the fact that the sayings which speak of the Kingdom as coming in the near future are not so numerous nor so important as those which declare the Kingdom to be present, and argues that our Lord's teaching had the nature of prophetic proclamation rather than apocalyptic revelation.

Actually Jesus is both present Saviour and coming Bringer of the Kingdom, so that he unites in His own Person the present aspect of the Kingdom with its future fulfilment. The believer therefore has not merely to wait for the future coming, but rather he lives in hope, knowing that his relation to Christ in the present determines his relation to the Judge at the end. This is a fine book. Its emphasis is already familiar to us, and in general its thesis is not a new contribution to those with Manson's *Teaching of Jesus* and Cullmann's *Christ and Time*. It has, however, exerted in Swiss thought much

the same influence as has Manson's book in British New Testament circles, and we can only hope that it will soon be translated into English, as already have so many other books in the series to which it belongs.

E. C. Rust

Origen: Prayer; and Exhortation to Martyrdom. Translated and Annotated by John J. O'Meara. (Being No. 19 of the **Ancient Christian Writers**). Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1954. 253 pages. $3.25.

Ancient Christian Writers has become one of the important series of patristic works in English translation.

The first treatise, *Prayer,* was composed *ca.* A.D. 233-234, and is an exposition of the meaning of prayer in general through the exposition of a particular prayer—the Lord's Prayer, or Model Prayer. This is therefore an important successor to Tertullian's and an anticipation of Gregory of Nyssa's treatises on the same subject.

The *Exhortation to Martyrdom* was written A.D. 235 following Alexander Severus' death on the Rhine and during the persecution which followed under Maximinus Thrax. The work is important for its revelation of much of Origen's personal religious viewpoint, as well as a major source of information on the persecution referred to.

This series as a whole is the best of the current Roman Catholic contribution to the Fathers in English translation. Its availability, plus the *Library of Christian Classics* and reprints of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* from the Protestant side, make continuing ignorance of early Christianity inexcusable.

T. D. Price

Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffes in der Modernen Bibelwissenschaft. (Schriften der Studiengemeinschaft der Evangelischen Akademien, 2). By C. Hartlich and W. Sachs. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr. viii, 191 pages. DM 9.80.

This book is a valuable contribution to one of the most significant areas of Biblical thought. It deals with the origin of mythical thinking in the modern approach to Biblical studies, and endeavors to trace the history of this somewhat ambiguous category in relation to Biblical exegesis. The result is a valuable study of the history of Biblical thought in Germany and also of the relation of this thought to the wider areas of German culture. Instead of beginning with D. F. Strauss as the originator of the mythological category, the authors trace the idea back to Christian Gottlob Heyne, a classical philologist of 18th century. They hold that Heyne's ideas were more easily applied to Biblical thought in the next century

because of certain foundation principles for the interpretation of Hebrew poetry elaborated, also in the 18th century, by R. Lowth.

This study of the origins of the mythological concept is thus more historical than theological, but it offers a valuable background to the current "demythologization" controversy which is convulsing theological circles in general, and the New Testament field in particular, on the Continent of Europe.

E. C. Rust

The Holy Spirit. By John Owen. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1954. 356 pages. $3.50.

John Owen, in the preface of his *Pneumatologia* in 1674, wrote: "I know not of any who ever went before me in Design of representing the whole Oeconomy of the Hoy Spirit." This was neither a boast nor due to lack of knowledge, for the work of the Puritan saint was a turning point in the history of Christian thought. The Church Fathers had written important things concerning the subject, but the condemnation of Montanism and Joachism had plunged the Church into an eclypse of the Spirit from which it did not recover until the Reformation. St. Thomas' treatment of the subject of revelation did not even mention the work of the Holy Spirit. The sixteenth century witnessed a resurgence of the Spirit in both Luther and Calvin, but English Puritanism of the seventeenth century became the fountain from which the evangelical concern with the Christian experience flowed. Many useful books have been written since John Owen's *Pneumatologia,* but few would have been written had Owen not pointed the way. It is good that this reprint of George Bruder's abridgment has been made available again.

Dale Moody

Faith and Justification. By G. C. Berkouwer. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954. 207 pages. $3.00.

This book by the Professor of Systematic Theology at the Free University of Amsterdam is yet another volume in his series of studies in dogmatic theology. It studies the history and significance of the doctrine of justification, and, within the limits set by its ultra-conservative position, provides a valuable and illuminating study. Our generation of preachers needs desperately to recover a sense of the reality of sin and of the nature of justifying faith. The wrong-headed misunderstanding of many of our greatest modern theologians, which appears at places in this book, should not be allowed to screen its value. The reviewer has the feeling that a true insight into Biblical thought rests with many of the men whom Berkouwer

criticizes rather than with the author, and one could wish that he were not so tied to the written word as sometimes to miss the living Word who speaks through it. The last section of the book contains a moving reminder that justification must lead to a life of faith, to sanctification.

E. C. Rust

The Reformation Era. By Harold J. Grimm. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954. 675 pages. $6.50.

One may judge from a hurried look at this book that Professor Grimm, even though treating of the Reformation *Era*, and not of the *Reformation only*, believes that the clue to the meaning of the era is religion. Events, men, and movements in the Christian Church control the scheme within which the story is unfolded. There is sensitive understanding of theological and ecclesiastical issues, while, at the same time, relations with cultural and political forces are disclosed.

Although there is a certain staccato note in the exposition, narrative is maintained at an interesting level. The book is a regular fund of information. It should be read by educated laymen. It also should do much to bring college students, who increasingly are not historically orientated, to be more conscious, for example, that Luther did not live contemporaneously with Thomas Aquinas or with Augustine, or even merely "in olden times."

T. D. Price

Christian Doctrine. By J. M. Shaw. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 379 pages. $6.00.

This is a valuable one volume systematic which has many admirable features. Its author is Professor of Systematic Theology at Queen's College, Ontario, and was a pupil of the late H. R. Mackintosh, one of the greatest of the Scottish theologians of this century. The famous Westminster Confession is frequently referred to, and the author is not above criticizing and restating its contents, a salutary feature in days when so many confessions need to be reshaped and re-expressed to meet our modern needs.

Professor Shaw presents us with a well balanced piece of work, in which the whole range of doctrine is treated and undue attention is not paid to any one aspect of Christian truth. He follows the time honored order—God, man and sin, redemption, the Christian life and eschatology, and includes a discussion of the historical development of the doctrines wherever he deems this called for. In the light of the new emphasis on special revelation in our time, one

wonders whether this scheme is as satisfying as one could hope. Every systematizer faces a problem here and Professor Shaw himself has to overlap and anticipate quite often. Partly, of course, the issue arises because Christian truth is an organic whole, and to treat one aspect of it is impossible without drawing in the whole body. How can one speak of God apart from the Incarnation or treat the doctrine of the Holy Trinity without elaborating the doctrine of the Holy Spirit? How can we speak of man's sin apart from the revelation of its abysmal nature in Calvary? How can we deal with Providence and the problem of evil apart from the Cross and Eschatology? Paul began with Christ, the Word Incarnate, and maybe that would suggest a re-ordering. Certainly he developed what, in some systematics, is still treated as a kind of natural theology, on the basis of the ultimate revelation, and elaborated the first creation in the light of the second. Another difficulty which we sense is that Dr. Shaw has not completely freed himself from the experiential approach, as the second chapter shows. His emphasis on Scriptural authority lacks a cutting edge, partly because he has not entered into a full understanding of the unity of Old and New Testament as promise and fulfilment and partly because he consequently omits an emphasis on Christ as the living Word of God who is Centre and Lord of Scripture. We look in vain for a discussion of the uniqueness and authority of the prophets and apostolic witnesses, which Brunner so finely elaborates in his systematic.

This, however, is not to depreciate a fine book. Many of the sections are moving, and the chapters on redemption and eschatology have excellent discussions. As an apologist, the reviewer was glad to see the great Christian truths brought into relation to contemporary thought and social patterns.

E. C. Rust

The Holy Spirit. By John F. Walvoord. Wheaton, Illinois; Van Kampen Press, 1954. 275 pages. $3.50.

Several years ago the author published in limited quantity these lectures on the Holy Spirit, but the present form has been revised and expanded. Having lectured on the historical development of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, the reviewer found it confusing to follow the alternation between the systematic and the historical approach to the subject. However, there are many helpful suggestions at various places in the volume. Of particular value are the pages on the Holy Spirit in relation to Christ and the Christian life, but there is some doubt that the author has the proper appreciation for the Pentecostal groups in contemporary Christianity. The two chapters on the Holy Spirit in the tribulation and in the Millennium are not likely to be commended by those uninitiated in such prophetic matters.

Dale Moody

The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages. By Walter Ullmann. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1955. 482 pages. 42s.

This "study in the ideological relation of clerical to lay power" is one of the most informative works on the medieval society which the reviewer has seen. Limited in its intention—which is to show how and under what circumstances the papal governmental authority grew—the work yet is interwoven in one way or another with the whole fabric of medieval life. In many ways it could be considered indispensable as background for the modern problem of the relationship of church and state.

In range the book covers from around the sixth century to the twelfth. It is based on study of original sources, and is written impartially and with good sense. Not a book for popular consumption, any interested and educated man will profit greatly by a careful study of it. The book is a sequel to the author's *Medieval Papalism, The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists.*

T. D. Price

Calvin, A Life. By Emanuel Stickelberger, translated by David Georg Gelzer. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1954. 174 pages. $2.75.

Much good literature is quite poor history, and much good history makes its way without adequate literary support. This volume is both adequate history and good literature. Making much use of the seven-volume Doumergue, and based largely on the Calvin correspondence, Stickelberger offers us a very readable biography of the Geneva reformer.

The author, a native of Basel, Switzerland, is a noted man of letters. The translator, himself a Basler, lives now in America. In a generation of revived interest in Calvin, this study makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of his life and times and work.

T. D. Price

Esther, Song of Songs, and Lamentations. By George A. F. Knight. London: S. C. M. Press; New York: Macmillan, 1955. 140 pages. $1.75.

This is a welcome addition to the Torch Series of Biblical Commentaries. Its author is already well-known as a Biblical scholar, and in this volume he has set himself to deal with some of the most difficult books in the Old Testament. The series itself sets out to provide for both minister and intelligent layman a commentary on the Bible which, while taking account of critical studies, draws out the essential message of the Bible and the contribution to Christian

thought of the individual books. In this task Professor Knight shows real ability, and we can be grateful for this piece of work.

His treatment of Lamentations is particularly able, especially because this book has been so widely ignored by Biblical scholars. He traces the theme of the suffering Servant in the dealing of God with Israel, His beloved Son, and shows how this theme underlies the thought of Lamentations. Lamentations speaks of the crucifixion of God's adopted Son, Israel, and interprets in part what God is doing in that great and terrible act. Knight makes much of the declaration that God has sent fire into Israel's bones from on high, and interprets this in the light of the extension of the divine personality through God's glory. God's Real Presence was with Israel in the judgment which God Himself had imposed and thus in some sense already God was bearing the penalty of Israel's sin upon his own "body," shaping the Son to become a true and faithful Servant. He is careful to show how this was at last fulfilled in our Lord, the seed of the original Promise, the heir of Israel after the flesh and Son of God Incarnate. This is a valuable little book.

E. C. Rust

Men Who Shape Belief. By David Wesley Soper. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 224 pages. $3.50.

Readers of David Wesley Soper's *Major Voices in American Theology* (1953) will welcome the additional report on more voices in American theology. Surveys of this type are useful guides to the important works by theologians of different traditions.

Theologians for special consideration are James Luther Adams, Douglas V. Steere, John A. MacKay, Walter M. Horton, John C. Bennett, Wilhelm Pauck, Harrison Franklin Rawl, W. Norman Pittenger, Louis Berkhof, Henry N. Wieman, and Edgar S. Brightman. A more complete list of those who shape belief should include at least one Dispensationalist. Louis Berkhof is a traditional conservative Calvinist, but the movement of Dispensationalism in the last half century has gained a following beyond that of most discussed in this book. No picture of American theology is complete that neglects the type of thought represented by Louis Sperry Chafer. It would be worth a drachma of any man's money to see Soper digest Chafer in a dozen pages!

Dale Moody

Secularism a Myth. By Edwin E. Aubrey. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 191 pages. $2.50.

Dr. Edwin E. Aubrey has long been a scholar of repute. He is currently Professor of Religious Thought in the University of Pennsylvania, and in this volume he has set himself to analyze the currents of thought in the contemporary religious world. He attacks

the arraignment of secularism in contemporary religious thought and objects to the use of the word as a rallying cry for the forces of religion. He analyzes what he believes to be a loose and false association of secularism with materialism, communism, totalitarian nationalism and even anti-clericalism, and contends that a true secularism can never be divorced from Christianity. Christianity has always interacted with the cultures in which it lives, enriching and being enriched by them. This section of the book is particularly lucid and valuable.

There is a provocative chapter on spiritual values in secular movements, which pre-supposes and raises issues about the relation of general to special revelation, and which the reviewer found both annoyingly wrong-headed in parts and yet challengingly lucid in others. Dr. Aubrey is at least concerned to set us thinking, and, much as we may disagree with his liberalism, we cannot ignore his thesis. Aubrey contends that Christianity ought to fight not secularism but the wrong values which take possession of culture, and that the church's task is to claim all areas of thought and life for Christ.

This is an able and challenging book. Its liberal spirit leans toward the older modernism but it has much to say to all of us, and we welcome its positive note. Another worldly Christianity will be of little value in the contemporary crisis, and so often that is all that we are preaching.

E. C. Rust

Christianity and Anti-Semitism. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Trans. by Alan A. Spears and Victor B. Kanter. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 51 pages. $2.75.

With incisive and discriminating insight Berdyaev discusses the perennial problem of racialism. Of the various types of anti-semitism he thinks that the religious is the most serious. It holds that the Jews are an accursed race because they rejected Christ. He points out that the Jews who "rejected the Cross have to carry it, while those who welcomed it are so often engaged in crucifying others." (p. 8). He follows with a brief but constructive critique of racialism from the point of view of religion, morality and science.

Berdyaev raises the question: "Can the Jewish problem be resolved within the bounds of history?" The answer lies not, he rightly says, in assimilation, Zionism, or eschatology, but in conversion to Christianity. But this spiritual reform advocated is not "a solution but a task, not an end but a beginning." This is one of the most powerful statements on anti-semitism that this reviewer has seen. No one interested in anti-semitism and racialism can afford to ignore this essay.

Henlee Barnette

A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology. By William Hordern. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 222 pages. $3.50.

Points of strength and weakness are found in this effort to give a popular and accurate statement of Protestant theology. The scheme of the book, both in proportion and division, is superbly conceived for a brief treatment. The style of the writing is as simple as possible for the subject. The statements of fact in most instances are accurate and free from bias.

At a few points, however, the author has, in the judgment of the reviewer, been unscientific and inaccurate. The statement of the understanding of the Trinity in the early church, especially on page 23, is difficult to substantiate in the study of the early documents. The view of the Trinity attributed to the Nicene Creed is that of Schleiermacher, who professed to follow Sabellius the ancient heretic. A solid reading of Claude Welch, *In This Name* (New York: Scribners, 1952), would perhaps modify Hordern's understanding of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. In the light of J. Gresham Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (New York: Harper, 1930, 1932), it is difficult to justify the statement that parallels to the Virgin Birth "were found among non-Christian religions" (p. 45). This claim of analogy was made, of course, by some Church fathers, but it is difficult to prove.

Questionable statements are found in a few other places. Luther segregated the Apocryphal books, but he did not throw them "out completely" (p. 60). The Apocrypha was eliminated first in the Geneva Bible of 1599. Ferdinand Ebner (*Das Wort und geistigen Realitaeten*, 1921) proclaimed the "I-Thou" relation to God before Martin Buber (p. 137), and Kierkegaard even before Ebner came close to this idea (John Cullberg, *Das du and die Wirklichkeit*, 1933). The Greek word for time in "the fullness of time" (Galatians 4:4) is *chronos*, not *kairos* (p. 182). *Kairos* is found in Mark 1:14.

The general conclusion of the book is in the right direction and as a guide for the general reader in Protestant theology it has great usefulness.

Dale Moody

Modern Science and God. By P. J. McLaughlin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 89 pages. $2.75.

This book is a translation with notes of the Papel address to the Pontifical Academy of Science in November, 1951. It is an attempt to show that the basic five ways of Thomas Aquinas are in no way impaired by modern science, but rather strengthened. The Pope shows considerable enlightenment on scientific matters where so often evangelical churchmen blunder and make cross statements. One

interesting point is his acceptance of the current cosmogony of the expanding universe and his contention that matter is neither eternal nor self-sufficient but points to the necessity of a Creator.

The Pope obviously relies much on "Space and Spirit," a book in which the veteran British scientist and convinced Catholic, Sir E. T. Whittaker, has ably elaborated a defense of the Christian view of creation, and sought to establish the five Thomistic proofs of a modern basis. The approach via a natural theology is not the one acceptable to the reviewer himself, who believes that God is found by us in nature only when He has found us in history, in Jesus Christ. Even so, this book offers valuable insights. It is also a warning that Catholicism is still making a bid for the intellectuals whilst evangelicals still wallow in sentimental slush and obscurantist jargon, apparently oblivious to the world of thought to which even their own young people are being subjected in the colleges and therefore totally unprepared for a Christian apologetic in a changing world of thought.

E. C. Rust

The Image of God in Man. By David S. Cairns. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 255 pages. $4.50.

With considerable heat and some light the theme of this book has been discussed as a central concern of Christian theologians for the past two decades. It has always been an important issue, but the present conflict of the Christian faith with a pagan world has, in the words of Psalm 8:4, sharpened the crucial question: What is man? Professor David S. Cairns has done a great service in this survey of the idea of the image of God from the Old Testament to the present. No other book on this subject that has come to our attention can compare with this splendid volume.

The author comes to a conclusion nearest to that of Emil Brunner in conflict with Karl Barth, and like Brunner he brings the idea to focus on the contemporary problems of culture and civilization. Those who follow Marxian and Freudian estimates of man will be made acutely aware of the inadequacy of such views of human nature.

The readers of this book are almost sure to put it down with a higher view of themselves and of others.

Dale Moody

Lutheran World Missions. Edited by Andrew S. Burgess. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954. 277 pages. $3.50.

The Lutherans of America are divided into almost as many different organizations as are the Baptists. It has therefore been difficult even for a Lutheran to have a comprehensive view of all

the mission work being carried on by the various Lutheran Churches and societies; for the non-Lutheran, this was a practical impossibility. Now for the first time, in this present volume, we have a unified, complete presentation of the foreign missions of American Lutherans.

Under the able editorship of Dr. A. S. Burgess, Professor of Missions at Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, with contributions from persons connected with the several Churches and societies, a clear and comprehensive picture of the foreign missions of ten American Lutheran Churches and four missionary societies is presented. The work of each agency is treated separately, but tables at the back of the book give a composite view. Some facts and figures concerning Lutheran missions by other than American bodies are added in some of the tables, giving added validity to the title, *Lutheran World Missions.* Helpful maps add to the usefulness of the volume.

Other denominations would do well to provide similar descriptions of their work. There is definite need for a book which would do for Baptist world missions what Professor Burgess has done for Lutherans.

H. C. Goerner

The Philosophy of the Teachings of Islam. By Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Washington: The American Fazl Mosque, 1953. 199 pages.

This book is not so much the teachings of Islam in the orthodox sense as it is the doctrine of the Ahmadiyya Movement, which is a modern cult founded in India in 1889. While based upon the Koran, it deviates from traditional Moslem teachings at important points. Aggressively missionary, it is found at work in the United States. This book has been published by the American branch of the movement with the obvious hope of showing the superiority of Ahmadiyya doctrine to Christianity. It is unlikely to have much effect in that regard. It does serve as a convenient record of the teaching of this unusual cult.

H. C. Goerner

God and Man in the Old Testament. By Leon Roth. London: George Allen and Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1955. 168 pages. $2.50.

In this book a distinguished Jewish scholar has attempted a symposium of passages from the Old Testament scriptures in which is portrayed the essential Hebrew view of God, man and man's sal-

vation. The preacher will find here a rich treasury of Old Testament texts gathered under such heads as "The Vision of the Almighty," "In Thee I Trust," "My People, My Chosen," "A Remnant Shall Return," "The End of the Matter." The object of the book is to present Hebrew thought systematically in the words of its own great thinkers. Dr. Roth merely contributes short but valuable introductory notes to each chapter. This is a useful handbook of Biblical passages for students of Old Testament theology, and it has the added value of being arranged for just such theological study.

E. C. Rust

The Shaking of the Foundations. By Paul Tillich. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1948. 186 pages. $2.50.

One of the most unusual personalities of our time is Paul Tillich, former professor of philosophical theology at Union Theological Seminary and now starting anew at Harvard Divinity School. Frequently the reviewer, who a decade ago had the happy experience as Tillich's teaching assistant, has been asked what position Paul Tillich represents. The answer has usually been simply that Paul Tillich is the only man in his position! Standing as he does as a preacher to preachers, and as a theologian to theologians, he is almost without a parallel.

Many of the sermons in this volume were delivered in the hearing of the reviewer. The memory of the sensation created by sermon nine on "Nature, also, Mourns for a Lost Good" is as vivid as if it were yesterday. The reader of these sermons, who may have the conservative religious background, may find it difficult to grasp or to appreciate the boundary position of Tillich, but it must be remembered that many of those who were first arrested by these sermons were radical skeptics who would not even listen to the professional parson. With certain people at certain times this type of apologetic preaching serves as a bridge across the yawning chasm between the secular mind and spiritual reality.

Dale Moody

The Stream of American History. By Leland D. Baldwin. New York: American Book Company, 1952. Two Vols. 1926 pages. $12.00.

This is a comprehensive, extremely readable, and highly instructive history of our nation. Professor Baldwin of the University of Pittsburgh has written the saga of American history with exquisite skill, insight and detachment. An amazing array of data bearing on the geographical, social, economic, political and religious background of American culture have been woven together so as to interpret

the rich heritage and achievement of our nation. Baldwin does not present a fictitiously idealistic picture of our history nor is he a cynical debunker. In the preface, appearing in each volume, he clearly states his belief in democracy and all that this belief entails.

The author boldly and honestly delineates both the heights and depths of our historical development as a nation, but he refuses to be either a neutralist onlooker or a final judge of the motives of men and movements that have decisively shaped our destiny. Believing in democracy, Baldwin candidly faces the truth, whether pleasant or not.

Volume I with 28 chapters details in Part I the genesis of the nation to 1787, while Part II and III deal with the rise of nationalism, 1787-1840 and the sectional conflict, 1820-1877. Volume II with 27 chapters analyzes in Part IV the consolidation of nationalism, 1877-1917, while Part V and Part VI review the pragmatic challenge, 1890-1929, and nationalism in transition, from 1929 to the Korean conflict. Each of the 55 chapters contains a bibliography on specialized subjects, while each separate volume also has a selective bibliography listing general reference works and collections of original and secondary sources. The indexes of authors and subjects run through more than 70 pages. The author's acumen and interpretative skill may be gleaned from some of the following citations: "Spain probably gave more culture to her colonies than England gave to hers. At least she gave all she had" (1:60). The Presbyterian Kirk ranks high as "an important school of self-government" (I:162). While "popular imagination has probably overrated the role of religious freedom as a reason for planning the colonies, . . . it certainly had some share in attracting immigrants" (I:173).

In view of the troubles that young nations like India have in determining their place in the concert of the nations, it is wholesome to be reminded once again of the long history of isolationism in the U.S.A. As to secession, both New England as well as Tennessee and Kentucky played with the idea long before the Civil War (I:381). Alexander Hamilton, brilliant, aristocratic, once said: "The people—your people is a great beast" (I:304). Thomas Jefferson, aristocratic democrat in one, viewed government as a natural enemy of the people. "Though he was probably a deist, he did not evangelize" (I:318). Despite landgraft, railroad scandals, political corruption, the waste of natural resources, "no great economy was ever built at so small a cost to the common man" (II:7). Teddy Roosevelt is described as a boisterous natural phenomenon, ranking next to Niagara Falls. "He had to be the bride at every wedding and the corpse at every funeral" according to his elder daughter Alice!

Every American may read these tomes with profit. College history professors will use it in their classes for years to come.

William A. Mueller

Amazing Grace. By L. E. Barton. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1954. 213 pages. $2.75.

Paul's letter to Ephesus speaks to the conditions of Christians of all ages, but it has a strange new relevance for the problems of our day. One of the last writings to come from the late Dr. W. O. Carver was his meditations on this majestic letter, and now another veteran Southern Baptist has given the fruits of many years of study. The book follows the order of the letter with thirteen chapter headings. Some lack of balance is seen in the fact that 164 pages are given to the first half of Ephesians, but only 48 pages are given to the second half.

The major values of the book are found in the frequent word studies and in practical illustrations and applications. The explanations of such words as redemption *apolutrosis,* pp. 53ff.), knowledge (epignosis, pp. 67f.), and heart (kardia, pp. 68ff.) are good examples of illustrations to be found in sound exegesis. The practical illustration of how Dr. Berry learned from experience the amazing grace of God is a warning to all shallow advocates of a diluted gospel as well as an illuminating illustration of the grace of God. An illustration with a human touch is seen in the experience of the engineer and his dying son (p. 104).

At two points in particular the facts do not seem to support the arguments. First, the claim that the church in Ephesians is either future or else generic, abstract and institutional (pp. 156f., 173f.) seems foreign to Ephesians 1:22f.; 3:10, 20; 4:4, 12, 15f.; 5:25. This error roots in the efforts to trace the idea of the church to the Greek city rather than the true source in the Old Testament. Second, the claim that Paul was once married seems out of line with I Cor. 9:5, *Suneudokon* in Acts 8:1; 22:20 (cf. Luke 11:48) and *Katenegka psephon* in Acts 26:10 are not sufficient to establish Paul as a member of the Sanhedrin. Long ago F. C. Conybeare argued with apparent success that Paul acted as the herald at the martydrom of Stephen.

Some minor errors should be corrected in any second edition. Eusebius wrote his church history in the fourth century (p. 15), and the gold at Fort Knox is not in Knox County, Kentucky (p. 49)! Does the author intend to make reference to Dr. R. C. Campbell (p. 18) and to Dr. John A. MacKay (p. 29)? We fail to see how "We love him" is the "common language of the Lord's Prayer" (p. 40), and Arabia (p. 48), Sunday (p. 126), and Burma (p. 166) are spelled incorrectly.

Dale Moody

Educational Psychology—A Book of Readings. Edited by Arthur P. Coladarci. New York: The Dryden Press, Inc., 1955. 650 pages. $3.90.

This excellent volume of "Readings" meets a long felt need in the field of educational psychology. It brings together under one cover the viewpoints of some fifty contemporary authorities, the materials having been organized and edited with rare skill. The reader is particularly gratified at the freshness of the materials and the vigor with which they are presented. The collection is not "loaded" through presentation of any dominant "school" of psychological thought, but contains a great variety of materials from many authorities.

A glance at the contents will indicate something of the scope and coverage of the volume. Consideration is given first to the increasing influence of psychology on educational practice. Behavior is viewed not organismically but developmentally. Insights are given the teacher as he seeks to understand pupil behavior. Following the lead of group dynamics, the "class" is studied in various aspects of its "field," with emphasis on the class as a psycho-sociological unit, with considerations of ecology and social climate, with case studies of relations between ability and social status, with experimental sociographic studies, with individual differences kept in focus.

Perhaps the two most valuable chapters have to do with learning in its "motivational aspects" and in the process of "maximizing transfer." No alert teacher can afford to ignore the experimental results indicated in these two almost revolutionary chapters. The final sections are devoted to pupil adjustment and guidance, in which the social worker and the psychiatrist are called on to assist in curriculum development; and the assessment of pupil status and progress in which some of the newest and most significant developments in educational tests and measurements are brought to bear on problems of improvement of teaching and learning.

This book is a "must" for teachers who would keep abreast of educational progress.

G. S. Dobbins

Nurse, Pastor, and Patient. By Granger Westberg. Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Press, 1955. 96 pages. $1.00.

Granger Westberg has had eight years of experience as chaplain of the Augustana Hospital in Chicago. He is at present Associate Professor of Pastoral Care of the Federated Theological Faculties of the University of Chicago. In *Nurse, Pastor, and Patient,* he records a hospital chaplain's talks with nurses.

In order to give this book a balanced review, the reviewer asked

his wife who has taught nursing arts in two hospitals and was at the time a patient in the hospital to read it. She was very enthusiastic about it and called attention especially to the helpful way Westberg distinguishes between a balanced Christian ministry to the sick and the "overly zealous" approach. The interview material with which nurse-patient conversation is illustrated makes the book a practical help in showing nurses how better to meet the "needs of the whole man." (p. 25.) Westberg is right in his contention that a pastor's visit is essentially different from a "visitor's visit." However, in his zeal to emphasize this difference he suggests that "a patient whose bath has just been started can usually be covered up with the bath blanket and a sheet without embarrassment to the patient." (p. 68.) Such a procedure may overlook the feelings of the patient. The presence of a clergyman during her bath might make a female patient ill at ease even though she were protected by the bath blanket and a sheet, suggests the reviewer's wife.

Baptists, because of their ecclesiological structure, will be unable to make much use of Westberg's suggestions on the use of the sacraments in Chapter 6, but that is a very minor limitation on the usefulness of this book. The author does such a clear job of interpreting the minister's work with the sick to the nurse that it would be excellent strategy for ministers to place copies of this book in nursing school libraries.

Hospital chaplains will find this book a helpful tool in teaching student nurses and in defining to their fellow staff members their own peculiar responsibilities.

Albert L. Meiburg

Sexual Understanding Among Young Married Adults. By B. David Edens. Durham, N. C.: Family Life Publications, Inc., 1955. 72 pages. $1.50.

One of the areas of concern for those who seek to develop a family life program in the local church is the matter of the status of sex knowledge in terms of specific information. The importance of adequate knowledge and attitudes about sex is well known. David Edens gives a report here of the experience of one pastor in the use of the Sex Knowledge Inventory, a standardized instrument published by Family Life Publications, Inc. This test was given to a Sunday School Class of young married adults in a semi-rural Baptist church. His preparation for this undertaking, its conduct and results are carefully analyzed for the benefit of other pastors. In the light of his study Edens makes some brief but pithy suggestions for a Marriage and Family Life Program in the church. Professor Wayne E. Oates, who writes the introduction wisely observes that "this study by David Edens is conclusive evidence that pastors who

are willing to take the time to prepare themselves can do far more than is being done to bring light and understanding to their people in programs of family life education within the teaching purpose of the Christian community." (p. 8.)

Because the information in this book is of little value for public consumption the publishers have restricted its sale to ministers, teachers, doctors, and other persons working in the field of family life. It will be a valuable teaching aid in courses in marriage and family counseling.

Readers of the *Review and Expositor* will note with interest the fact that Mr. Edens is a 1954 Th.M. graduate of Southern Seminary, the project for this book being also the subject of his thesis.

Albert L. Meiburg

Christian Journalism for Today. By Benjamin Browne. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1952. 250 pages. $2.50.

This volume brings together addresses delivered at the Christian Writers and Editors' Conferences held at Philadelphia and Green Lake, Wisconsin. The papers were prepared with evident care and have been skillfully organized to form "a resource book for writers and editors." American Baptists for the most part, the contributors represent such well-known writers as Luther Wesley Smith, Richard W. Graves, Lawrence E. Nelson, Gerald E. Knoff, Eric G. Haden, Clifton J. Allen, Wheeler McMillen, John Calvin Slemp, Margaret Applegarth, Edith Lovejoy Pierce, Mary Alice Jones, Harold L. Phillips, and the editor, Benjamin P. Browne. The plan of the book is indicated by its several parts: (1) What Is It All About? (2) What Do You Have to Say? (3) For Whom Do You Write? (4) How to Do the Job; (5) From Behind the Editor's Desk; (6) Where to Sell It. Everyone who writes for the press or for Christian publications will find this book stimulating and helpful.

G. S. Dobbins

The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel. By E. J. Young. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954. 88 pages.

To the uncritical and undiscerning this book will doubtless be acceptable, but its position is well nigh impossible for any who have been trained in real Biblical scholarship. Dr. Young is himself a well equipped student, and it is all the more discouraging to find him turning his back upon facts and arguments which condemn his whole position. There are flashes of insight in these pages which make one fervently wish that their author could adopt a more reasonable approach to Holy Writ. For ourselves we cannot commend this book as it stands.

E. C. Rust

The Old Testament. By T. H. Robinson. London: Duckworth; New York: Macmillan, 1953. 168 pages. $1.75.

This little book by a veteran British Old Testament scholar is a veritable *multum in parvo*. Here in small compass we have a masterly survey of the contents and critical problems of the Old Testament books. Like H. H. Rowley's "Growth of the Old Testament" and H. W. Robinson's "The Old Testament: Its Making and Meaning," this book is designed for introductory courses to the Old Testament literature, and we hope that all students taking our basic required Old Testament courses will acquaint themselves with it or the other two books. There is an excellent bibliography appended to this volume. We commend it to all who desire to know more about the Old Testament.

E. C. Rust

By the Power of God. By Samuel M. Shoemaker. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 158 pages. $2.00.

A veteran Episcopal minister, in deadly earnest, pleads with his fellow ministers and the members of his communion to meet the conditions according to which may be released through them the power of God. Trenchantly he asks, "What will shake the Episcopal Church awake?" He goes back to his twenty-five years of experience in Pittsburg, a "key city," where Christianity has been tried out as on a proving ground.

With some impatience this rugged rector brushes aside formalism and verbalism and goes to the heart of the need for human interest, faith, humor, compassion, experience and knowledge, imagination, truthfulness, humility. "What we really need," he frankly declares, "is the conversion of the Episcopal Church from top to bottom, beginning with our Bishops, going right through our clergy, and all our people." Continuing, he says: "We need genuine revolution, of spirit and of methods. We shall not get it by short-lived dissatisfaction nor by short-lived resolutions. . . . Our suggested nostrums and panaceas are simply too shallow, too cheap, too remote from the deep needs of our hearts to produce any such thing." He then concludes: "The spiritual revolutionizing of the Episcopal Church might let loose a flood of power that would sweep the world."

No one can read this book without a fresh stirring of conscience and conviction and a deepened desire to be an effective channel for the power of God.

G. S. Dobbins

Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments. Edited by G. S. Kirk. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1954. xvi, 424 pages. $9.50.

All scholars of Greek philosophy and literature will welcome this excellently edited edition of the Cosmic Fragments of Heraclitus.

The editor, in a learned introduction, discusses the date of Heraclitus, considers the available evidence as to his life, and critically assesses the various sources for indications of Heraclitus' thought. Each fragment is supplied with a translation and copious footnotes.

To Heraclitus we owe the introduction of the idea of the Logos as the all pervading constituent of the world of flux, the formula by which the oneness of the process of becoming is assured. He identified the Logos especially with fire which occupied the directive position in the elements between sea and earth and so organized the ceaseless change or oscillation between these two. Kirk contends that Heraclitus' influence was marred by the advent of the Parmenidean fallacy although the solution of the latter was an important factor in philosophical advance. This is a valuable and learned book.

E. C. Rust

How to Be An Effective Church Woman. By Carolyn P. Blackwood. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 190 pages. $2.50.

The author might at one time have been identified as the wife of Andrew W. Blackwood, author of many volumes and now emeritus professor of Princeton Seminary. Her previous book, *The Pastor's Wife*, and this recent volume accredit her as a writer of first-rate importance in her own right. Supplementing her own wide experience and observation with thoroughgoing investigation, Mrs. Blackwood describes the work of the church woman in her manyfold capacities as a grateful Protestant, a loyal church member, an active church worker, a regular church officer, a missionary promoter, an inter-church leader. The author then spells out in concrete detail ways in which the church woman may serve fruitfully—as an assistant to the pastor, as a leader in group worship, as a planner of church programs, as chairman of a church meeting, as an inspirer of church women, as a raiser of church money, as a trustee of God's treasure, as an example of Christian love.

The women of any church will profit greatly by the reading and study of this excellent book.

G. S. Dobbins

Readings in the Philosophy of Religion. Edited by John A. Mourant. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1954. xi and 500 pages. $2.95.

The editor of this very useful collection of readings is Professor of Philosophy in the Pennsylvania State University. He has made a truly catholic selection of his sources, and has gathered them together in a useful schematization. It is valuable, for example, to

find a section on eschatology following the one which deals with evil, and to find in this section sources that treat predestination as well as a particularly useful selection of material on immortality. It is good to find modern thinkers such as Berdyaev, Maritain, Brunner, Barth, Buber, and Alexander drawn upon, and to find a symposium in which Calvin and Luther are not passed over, whilst the mystics are still given a fair share of attention. This is a valuable source book to accompany a course in Philosophy of Religion, and it is made still more valuable by the explanatory notes with which the editor introduces his readings.

E. C. Rust

A Manual for Discussion Leaders and Participants. By Paul Bergevin and Dwight Morris. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1954. Paper bound, 75 pages. $1.00.

"Group discussion" has come to be a favorite method of teaching, problem solving, church and social action. This guide is of unusual value in that it clearly describes the group discussion method, clears up many practical difficulties, details the duties of the discussion leader, and gives directions for the participants and their responsibilities. Intended primarily for guidance of community services in adult education, it can be easily translated into terms of church work.

G. S. Dobbins

Christian Worship. By George Hedley, New York: The MacMillan Co., 1953. 302 pages. $4.50.

Few books on worship contain so much information as this presentation of "meanings and means." The author is chaplain and professor of sociology and economics at Mills College, Oakland, California. Moved by the needs of faculty, students, and ordinary church members for better understanding of the significance of worship and how it may become a vital experience, the chaplain has brought together a wealth of materials that deal with origins, history, usage, symbols, ceremonials, occasions, interpretations of worship. Almost every aspect of the subject is covered, informatively and entertainingly. Especially valuable are the appendices, covering bibliography, fixed dates of the "Christian year," an evaluation of standard hymnals, current Western liturgies, typical chapel services, benedictions and ascriptions.

G. S. Dobbins

The Altar Fire. By Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, n.d. (1954). 126 pages. $2.00.

"Reflections on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" which stress, (1) the centrality of the Supper in Christian worship, (2) the nature of the Supper as an encounter between God and man, and (3) the function of the Supper in bringing home to worshippers all that God has done for them in Christ.

Well grounded in the history of Eucharistic thought and sensitive to a wide tradition of Christian devotion, this little book will help anyone and, probably, be considered completely adequate by no one. It is worth the price.

T. D. Price

Appointment With God. By J. B. Phillips. London: The Epworth Press, 1954. 76 pages. 5s. net.

Those who are familiar with Mr. Phillips' translation of the New Testament and with his writings need not be told of his clarity and insight. Affirming his loyalty to the Anglican tradition, he nevertheless writes very much like a Baptist in this treatise on the Lord's Supper, which is designated as "some thoughts on Holy Communion." He rejects both transubstantiation and consubstantiation, arguing for common sense and essential honesty in the observance of the Memorial Supper, which is, however, "more than memorial." What elements constitute this "more?" Mr. Phillips finds it in its significance for deepened fellowship, in its provision of spiritual nutrition, in the claiming of Chirst's presence within us, in the enrichment and expansion of selfhood. Rejecting the sacrament as re-presentation, the Catholic doctrine of the "Real Presence," he shows the Supper as representation, reminding us of the cost of our redemption and our unpayable debt of gratitude. The meditations close with a plea for spiritual preparation of both minister and congregation for worthy observance of this meaningful memorial. The minister will find in the several brief chapters stimulating suggestions for periods of meditation accompanying the administration of the Supper.

G. S. Dobbins

Katherine, Wife of Luther. By Clara S. Schreiber. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954. 232 pages. $2.75.

A novel about the life of Katherine von Bora, wife of the great German reformer. Not transcendantly great literature, the book yet captures much of the spirit of the time and family with which it deals. Much of authenic history appears in its pages. Pleasant and profitable.

T. D. Price

How To Develop Your Thinking Ability. By Kenneth S. Keyes, Jr. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1952. 246 pages. $2.50.

The author begins by acknowledging his debt to the late Alfred Korzybski, formulator of the science of general sematics. Those who have read Korzybski know that he is not especially easy to follow. Mr. Keyes has quite overcome this difficulty. He writes in easy, popular, journalistic style, presenting his ideas somewhat after the fashion of the newsstand books on applied psychology. The profuse illustrations by a pen and ink artist give the impression of the comic book, but are intended to meet the "test of readability." The author modestly guarantees that the first five chapters will provide an effective system for developing thinking ability and that this system of straight thinking will enable the reader to (1) get along better with other people; (2) build a happier marriage; (3) be successful in business; (4) find causes for things that worry; (5) help build a world free from war and want. Ministers may take these promises with a grain of salt; nevertheless the book furnishes entertaining reading and has in it a lot of practical sense.

G. S. Dobbins

Finney Lives On. By V. Raymond Edman. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1952. 250 pages. $2.50.

The student of the history of evangelism in America recognizes in Charles G. Finney one of the most important figures in the Christianity of a century ago. To him perhaps more than to any other man is due the revivalistic character of American evangelism. His story is told vividly and compellingly. The author has searched diligently to get the facts about the man, details of his methods, and the heart of his message. The book goes far toward explaining the genius of "mass evangelism" as practiced even until today and will stir the reader to renewed faith in the power of the preached word to convict of sin and lead to confession of Christ. Present-day evangelists can learn much from this herald of the Gospel who moved his generation closer to God.

G. S. Dobbins

Christian Worship—A Service Book. By G. Edwin Osborn. St. Louis: The Christian Board of Publication, 1953. 590 pages. $4.50.

Professor of practical theology at the College of the Bible of Phillips University (Disciples of Christ) for a decade, Dr. Osborn has gathered an immense amount of materials which supply a lifetime of resources for public worship. Almost every conceivable need is anticapted—for the regular Sunday services, for baptism and the

Lord's Supper, for receiving new members, for solemnizing marriage, for funerals, for ordination and installation of a minister, for installation of church officers, teachers, and others. Part II provides an almost inexhaustible treasury of materials of worship—calls to worship, invocations, collects, opening prayers, prayers for many occasions, litanies, offertory prayers, and the like. Part III contains a lectionary of readings, biblical and otherwise. To possess this book is almost equivalent to having a library of smaller volumes on worship.

G. S. Dobbins

Columbus Roberts—Christian Steward Extraordinary. By Spright Dowell. Nashville: Broadman Press. 170 pages. $1.50.

It is fitting that the president-emeritus of Mercer University should have written this stirring story of a Georgia layman who did much to make secure the foundations and the future of the College. Dr. Dowell has in the main let Mr. Roberts tell his story in his own words, the author's part being largely that of gathering and editing the materials and interpreting the results. The story of this remarkable businessman, who consecrated his talents and his wealth to Christ, should prove an inspiration to multitudes of laymen who in lesser or greater situations of opportunity might in large measure duplicate Mr. Roberts' career.

G. S. Dobbins

A Christian Approach to Philosophy. By Warren C. Young. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1954. 252 pages. $4.00.

Professor Young of Northern Baptist Seminary holds that "the main purpose of this work is to provide an introduction to philosophy for evangelical Christian colleges" (p. 10). In thirteen well written chapters the author examines the nature of philosophy, the methods and postulates underlying various philosophical systems (rationalism, naturalism, idealism, Christian realism), the problem of truth (semantics, immediate, social and philosophical criteria), the problem of knowing, both negative and positive, (agnosticism, skepticism, positivism, phenomenalism), various theories of knowledge (monism, dualism, instrumentalism), the world we live in, the origin of living forms, the nature of consciousness, problems of value theory, teleology versus mechanism, the empirical approach to religion, various empirical philosophies of life (from materialism to idealism), with the last two chapters given to the author's own Christian realism. Young states his own view in these words:

> The basic assumption of the Christian realist is the reality of the supernatural world, and that God has revealed Himself in a unique way. The Christian realist, too, believes that a coherent view of experience must be attained, but

> for him, as opposed to all the others who have been discussed, coherence must make room for divine self-disclosure. The one who is living under the firm conviction of the truth of the Christian philosophy of life does so because he knows that God has spoken to him. While the Christian realist agrees with the rationalist that there is a valid truth in the deductive sense, while he agrees with the naturalist in that there is a legitimate place in scientific investigation for the experimental method, and while he agrees with the idealist in that there is a truth to be obtained which is aside from both of these, he disagrees with all of them in that he holds there is a transcendent truth which comes to man from God Himself. (p. 42).

This is an informing book which may aid the college and seminary student as well as the intelligent layman in serious reflective thinking in terms of the Christian perspective.

William A. Mueller

The Namic Philosophy. By John Embry. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. 238 pages. $3.75.

The author defines namic as denoting action, that is, his concern is for a holistic interpretation of reality and religion. Through fifteen chapters the authors discusses a variety of subjects, surveying the philosophies of epistemological idealism (Berkeley, Fichte, Bergson, Hegel *et. al.*) as well as epistemological realism (Locke, Hume, James) and the critical idealism of Kant. Chapter III deals with logical forms of thought, furnishing definitions of universal and general notions, reasoning from analogy induction and deduction, the ways of practical reasoning and the purport of pragmatic thinking. In Chapter IV certain philosophies of religion come under review.

Chapters V to IX dip into the meaning of mechanism, energetics, problems of heredity and the law of biogenesis, certain theories of the mind (behaviorism, parallelism, epiphenomenalism, Gestalt psychology, the problematic of psychology as a science and the relation between instinct and intuition) and finally evolution in its various forms comes under critical analysis. Chapters X to XV, in turn, deal with more specifically religious problems, that is, the problem of God in Hebrew thought, Israel's spiritual development, Christ, the Son of God, divine immanence, the Christian ethic, and the New Testament. "Namic Transcendency," according to Embry, "is the intellectual linkage between that of the existence and linear sequences of finite things and the eternal positive of the universe of being" (p. 230). The conclusions of namic philosophy are rather vague and nebulous to this reviewer.

William A. Mueller

The Church and Mental Health. Edited by Paul B. Maves. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955. 303 pages. $4.00.

Articles in symposium books usually are uneven in quality, but Paul Maves has successfully avoided that problem in this remarkable book. He has chosen uniformly competent persons who gave careful, considerate, and devout attention to the particular problems upon which they wrote.

The point of view of the book is holistic, both from the standpoint of human personality and from that of the nature of the church. The book as a whole is one of which Protestants can justly be proud as a companion volume on their shelves with Van der Veldt and Odenwald's *Psychiatry and Catholicism* (McGraw-Hill, $6). These two volumes represent the response of Christendom to the ethical issues of our day raised by the tremendous advances in the understanding, care, and treatment of the mentally ill.

The book has seven divisions:

"The Meaning of Mental Health" is discussed by Gotthard Booth, David E. Roberts, and Florence Powdermaker.

"Religion in Illness and Health Through the Centuries" is dealt with by John T. McNeill and Seward Hiltner.

Paul Maves, Cyril C. Richardson and Gene E. Bartlett treat "Potentialities in the Christian Community for Illness and Health."

"Fostering Mental Health Through the Church Program" is treated in an article by Luther Woodward.

Howard C. Schade and Ernest E. Bruder approach "A Ministry to the Mentally Ill" from the point of view of the parish and mental hospital, respectively.

Dallas Pratt, a New York psychiatrist, gives careful consideration to the subject: "The Parish Minister and the Psychiatrist in Cooperation and Contrast."

Finally, Paul Maves, Seward Hiltner, Reuel L. Howe, and Daniel Blain deal with the problems of "A Total Strategy for the Churches in Relation to Illness and Health."

The book makes several contributions but particularly useful, I think, are the sections on the history of this concern of the church and the section on the training and health of the minister himself.

One could wish that the authors had given us a working hypothesis of what they conceive the church to be: at one time it is a face-to-face group of persons related to each other dynamically in faith. At another time, the church represents the agreed upon and accrued values and spiritual insights of historical Christianity, and at even another time, the church is seen as a specific organization

which can do certain practical deeds in behalf of the mentally ill and their families.

Furthermore, a specific section on the basic distinction between the problem of the clinical management of distorted religious ideas which are such a perplexing problem to the average minister would have been most helpful.

But books, like reviews, cannot cover everything. This book will serve a vital function for years to come as the definitive work on the church and mental health from a Protestant point of view.

Wayne E. Oates

Irrationalism and Rationalism in Religion. By Robert Leet Patterson. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1954. 155 pages. $3.00.

The author wrestles with the perennial problem of faith and reason. Are the two co-ordinate authorities? Or should faith be subordinated to reason? Or must we subordinate reason to faith? Patterson sharply analyzes the positions of the naturalist, the logical positivist, the pure phenomenologist and the neo-supernaturalist. Those who hold to the naturalist view, our author asserts, are unable to account for the emergence of novelty, the continuity of the self amidst the flux of psychic states, nor for these psychic states themselves. It is preposterous to claim that verification of data may only be in terms of sense-perceptions. Naturalists' talk of God and religion is futile since they deny in principle any reality beyond the empirical.

That Patterson brackets the neo-supernaturalists with the naturalists is strange indeed. Seemingly it is the disparagement of reason that is a mark of both schools of thought. However, Patterson, who states the position of the rationalist in such a fine manner, makes statements about Barth which hark back to the days of the *Roemerbrief*, but without taking account of later works of the Basel theologian. Barth does not place man's sin in his finitude, but in his rebellion against God. To say that Barth rejects the idea of a personal God is not warranted if he is properly interpreted. Theology to Barth is a human, rational endeavour to point out what God has wrought for man's salvation. Nor does Barth deny the possibility of a Christian philosophy *per se*. Barth also affirms (KD 1:2, pp. 816-17) that no one can read the Bible without some such glasses, i.e., some philosophical conceptual framework. *Re* anthropomorphisms and their necessity see KD II:1, pp. 250, 296, 321, and 415-6; also KD IV:1, p. 626.

William A. Mueller

The Christian View of Sexual Behavior: A Reaction to the Kinsey Report. By W. Norman Pittenger. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1954. 71 pages. $1.50.

This is not another critique of the Kinsey reports, but a theologian's response to the view of sex implicit in the type of research which Kinsey and others are doing. W. Norman Pittenger, Professor of Christian Apologetics at General Theological Seminary, gives in this book a brief and readable treatise on the sacramental nature of sex in the Christian view. The author affirms the centrality of sex in human personality and points out how this makes sex capable of contributing to man's highest fulfilment or his lowest degradation. One of the most refreshing chapters is the one entitled "What Is Chastity" in which Professor Pittenger declares that *vocation* is the determinant of the particular variety of one's chastity. There are different expressions of chaste living but celibacy is not *per se* better, he says.

It is a hopeful sign that amid the confusion which marks contemporary sex ethics, there is growing agreement and declarations by theologians of such divergent communions as Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant. This is evident if one is familiar with the sources described in the valuable reference list on page 69f. of this volume. This book would be a worthy introduction for those who wish to find a more adequate view of sex than that left to them by purely biological, sociological, or statistical views.

Albert L. Meiburg

Inside Buchmanism. By Geoffrey Williamson. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 227 pages. $4.75.

This is a critical study of Buchmanism, also known as the Oxford Group Movement and Moral Rearmament, by a prominent British publicist. This study was undertaken with the explicit approval of the leaders of this movement. The author claims to have carefully studied some 12 books and reports on Buchmanism before visiting Caux, the assembly place of Moral Rearmament in Switzerland. Despite all the courtesy shown him while at Caux in 1949, Williamson turned thumbs down on Buchmanism. He does admit that Frank Buchman, the founder of Moral Rearmament "has never lost sight of those principles" which he avowed at the beginning of his eventful career as a Christian life-changer. Buchman and his followers have no doubt influenced many people in every land of the earth for good.

In Chapters 8 and 9 Williamson charges that Peter Howard in London in a subtle manner tried to censor his articles on the movement. But he dismisses Moral Rearmament as utopian idealism. Its belief in absolute God-control seems fantastic to a hard-hitting

newspaper man like Williamson. "I don't believe that God will do anything for us that we are capable of doing for ourselves. It is when we are in extremity and powerless that He sometimes steps in" (p. 220). But is not this view Deism? Williamson also charges Moral Rearmament with the religious regimentation of youth, forced heartiness and fawning upon the titled and wealthy. Their high-pressure politics in general and anti-Communist activities in particular are also odious to Williamson.

On the other side of the ledger, who can deny that Buchman has through the years helped many nominal Christians to realize a deeper devotion to Christ and his Kingdom?

William A. Mueller

Neurosis and Human Growth. By Karen Horney, M.D. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1950. 388 pages. $4.00.

This last book of Dr. Horney's before her recent death contains much of her philosophy concerning life and its meaning. During much of her brilliant career as psychiatrist, Dr. Horney sought the causes as well as the cure of neurosis. At one time she was of the opinion that neurotic behavior stems largely from the frustration of self-realization. In this last work she concludes that the compulsiveness which we characterize as "neurotic" is at bottom an exaggerated "search for glory." All the drives for glory have in common "the reaching out for greater knowledge, wisdom, virtue, or powers than are given to human beings; they all aim at the *absolute,* the unlimited, the infinite . . . The neurotic is . . . one who is not satisfied with knowing a great deal, but has to know everything." Continuing, she concludes, ". . . the easy way to infinite glory is inevitably also the way to an inner hell of self-contempt and self-torment. By taking this road, the individual is in fact losing his soul—his real self."

The remainder of this penetrating discussion deals with the various aspects of this "search for glory" which finds expression in individuals who have lost their balance. Out of an enormous experience with such persons, the psychiatrist paints the picture of neurotic pride, of self-hate and self-contempt, of mistaken measures to relieve tension, of morbid dependency and resignation, of disturbances in human relationships and in work. The closing chapters are devoted to therapy, a field in which Dr. Horney was amply qualified to speak with authority.

G. S. Dobbins

Rural Preaching. By Edward K. Ziegler. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1954. 158 pages. $2.00.

When the Rural Missions Committee of the Foregin Missions Conference of North America surveyed published materials on the rural church in 1945, they discovered that very little has been written

about preaching in the rural churches. In this book Edward K. Ziegler gives us a worthy discussion of the challenge, opportunities, and resources for the rural preacher. The author, whose father before him was a rural preacher, writes out of his own experience as a pastor in rural areas of India as well as the United States. He is, therefore, well aware that the need for an adequate rural ministry is a worldwide need. He tends to deal with the universals of rural life.

The author shows an awareness of some of the contemporary sociological problems of rural ministry, but his sources tend to be dated at this point. For example, his bibliography on rural life cites no sources which make use of the 1950 census. This no doubt reflects the probability that the manuscript has been sometime in preparation. The author infers this in his preface. However, this time of preparation has resulted in a work which shows refined understanding and clear, direct style.

There are two recurring notes in the book. The first is that there are some special applications of the Gospel to rural life. The second is that in his preaching the rural pastor must make contact with his people where they are.

The readability and significance of this book commend it as a helpful manual of encouragement and guidance for the rural minister. The publishers are to be commended for pricing it within the reach of the country preacher. It deserves wide circulation and would make an excellent text for pastors institutes, and short courses.

Albert L. Meiburg

Pastoral Preaching. By David A. MacLennan. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 157 pages. $2.50.

Readers of the *Review and Expositor* will note with interest that this latest book by Dr. LacLennan is largely composed of materials delivered in the Mullins Lectures on Preaching at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1953. The enheartening quality of the lectures is happily retained in their printed form, and this will enable many who appreciated the man in his message to renew their acquaintance with both.

Affirming that preaching is of the essence of the Christian ministry, the author goes on to ask, "What kind of preaching deserves such a high estimate?" He finds the answer in *Pastoral Preaching,* which he defines as "a communication of the Good News by one whose relationship to persons is that of shepherd of souls." In taking this stand Dr. MacLennan is directly in line with the medieval handbook which asked the question, "Who can preach?" and answered it by the assertion, "The priest who has *the cure of souls.*"

The author discusses the perspectives, objectives, resources, and

methods of pastoral preaching. His treatment reflects the maturity of his own experience as a pastor and is enlivened by a wealth of illustrations drawn from current literature. However, there is a real need for someone who is in a strategic position such as that occupied by the writer as professor of preaching and pastoral care at Yale Divinity School to explore more fully the inter-relation of the newer pastoral care with preaching. We are still in need of "a unifying word" here.

Nevertheless, this book is sound in its theoretical basis, and is true to its intention to re-affirm the pastoral importance of preaching. Pastors who drink from it will go on their way refreshed.

Albert L. Meiburg

The Word on the Brazos. By J. Mason Brewer. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1953. 109 pages. $3.50.

It is a delight to find a book of folklore so beautifully written. To some of us the dialect of the negro of bygone days has a charm. The author, a cultured negro, has performed a service for his people by preserving these stories in the dialect of post-slavery days. Some of them are known to us but the writer gives to them an artistic freshness.

Set in the atmosphere of the Brazos river-bottom plantations these tales are of the doings of the preachers and their flocks. They evidence the wisdom, the ready satire and the flashing wit of the Negro. Sistuh Rosie was willing to face reality when at the funeral service for her'low-down, no-count, gamblin'son' she heard the preacher extolling Christian virtues unknown to him. "She cain't hol' her peace no longuh; so she squall out rail loud, 'You sho' is tellin' a lie now; hab mercy, Lawd, hab mercy." Sistuh Rosie 'low de preachhuh practicin' Bad Religion."

You will smile at the characters but you will recognize them. Do not miss this book.

Inman Johnson

Not Regina. By C. C. Kauffman. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1954. 229 pages. $2.50.

Tremendous events disturbed the industrious and well ordered life of the Swiss people in the second and third decades of the sixteenth century. Scarcely a writer has been able to present the atmosphere of that stirring period so well as Mrs. Kauffman in her brief novel, *Not Regina*. The Swiss brethren or Anabaptists under the leadership of the learned comrade, Grebel, in 1524 to 1525 parted

company from Ulrich Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, over differing concepts of the church.

Zwingli was committed to the state church; Grebel was out to restore apostolic Christianity. The Anabaptists wanted believer's baptism instead of infant baptism and felt that the state should have nothing to do with running the church. The civic councils, Protestant and Catholic, opposed the Anabaptists and sought to destroy them. The novel is the stirring account of a young girl whose family is shaken and torn by the religious conflict of her day. It excells most histories of the time in presenting the faith of and the issues confronted by the Swiss brethren, to whom modern Baptists willingly admit their indebtedness.

W. L. Lumpkin

The Master Is Here. By Elbert Neil Johnson. American Press, 1955. $2.50.

Reinhold Niebuhr has reminded us that we can know neither the temperature of hell nor the furniture of heaven. New Testament scholars are in general agreement that Jesus did not concern himself with specific data on either realm but addressed his hearers on matters of the here and now. And when he withdrew his physical self from his followers he left them his presence—*parousia* is the theological word—in the person of the Holy Spirit. Hence through the ages since his ascension men and women have been able, just as truly as Martha the sister of the dead Lazarus, to say, "The Master is here . . . .".

In his book which has this beautiful sentence for a title a revered and scholarly Baptist preacher has made a convincing and vital statement of the *parousia.* The book is the fruit of many years of meditation and scholarly research upon the theme of our at-homeness now with him whom someone has called our "eternal contemporary." At his ascension, Johnson tells us, Jesus withdrew from our sight that he might reveal himself to our insight. In our joys and sorrows, days of toil and hours of ease, in our straits and wrestlings, his great consoling and strengthening word is ever, "Lo, I am with you always."

> Speak to Him thou for He hears, and
> Spirit with Spirit can meet—
> Closer is He than breathing, and nearer
> than hands and feet.

The book will serve as a health anti-dote to the traditionalism which seeks to encase the living Christ in creed or sacrament, to the narrow sectarianism which arrogates him to a denomination and to the eschatology which builds its only hope on the sweet by and by.

W. W. Finlator

Devotions and Prayers of John Calvin. Compiled by Charles E. Edwards. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954. 120 pages. $1.00.

Single-page expository excerpts from Calvin's Commentaries on the Minor Prophets, each balanced by one of the prayers which accompanied their original delivery.

Men as Trees Walking. By Margaret T. Applegarth. Harper and Brothers: New York, 1952. 282 pages. $3.00.

More than eighty excellent stories of the work of the Spirit of God in the lives of men.

A Diary of Readings. By John Baillie. Scribner's: New York, 1955. 365 pages. $2.50.

A marvelous collection of prayers, one for each day of the year, chosen with discrimination from devotional literature by the Dean of the Faculty of Divinity in Edinburgh University.

Keep Your Voice Healthy. By Friedrich S. Brodnitz. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. 225 pages. $3.50.

Excellent advice for a preacher. The book may not enable you to remedy vocal faults but it can help you understand them and prevent them.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Golden Book of Immortality. By T. C. and H. D. Clark. New York: Association Press. 227 pages. $2.50.

Choir Ideas. By Flora E. Breck. W. A. Wilde: Boston, 1952. 142 pages. $2.00.

Let Us Pray. By Albert Buckner Coe. New York: George W. Stewart, Publisher, Inc., 1952. 157 pages.

Meditations and Verse. By Ralph Spaulding Cushman. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952. 89 pages. $1.25.

Eighty Adventurous Years. By Sherwood Eddy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 255 pages. $3.00.

The Dream Is Certain. By Doris Hedges. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1954. 32 pages. $1.50.

The Chorale. By Edwin Liemohn. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953. 159 pages. $2.50.

Man and God In the City. By Kenneth D. Miller. New York: Friendship Press, 1954. 175 pages. $2.00.

Prayer Meeting Talks and Outlines. A Collection. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954. 96 pages. $1.75.

A Way of Survival. By Arthur W. Munk. New York: Bookman Associates, 1954. 148 pages. $3.00.

Songs for Juniors. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1953. 182 songs.

Music Levels in Christian Education. By Herbert G. Tovey. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1952. 143 pages. $2.00.

Life Looks Up. By Charles B. Templeton. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 192 pages. $2.50.

Preaching on Bible Characters. By Faris D. Whitesell. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955. 150 pages. $2.50.

The Carillon. By Lawrence W. Pearson. New York: Morehouse Gorham Co., 1952. 136 pages.

When the King Comes Back. By Oswald T. Smith. Wheaton, Ill.: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1955. $1.50. 136 pages.

The Rogue and the Witch. By Edward Newton. New York: Abelard-Schuman, Inc., 1955. $3.50. 276 pages.

The Way of Love. By Harold Boyer. Anderson, Ind.: The Warner Press, 1955. $1.00. 96 pages.

Two Sons. By Wm. M. Elliott. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1955. $1.50. 62 pages.

Prophetic Light in Present Darkness. By Kenneth S. Wuest. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955. $2.00. 135 pages.

Spiritual Values in Shakespeare. By Ernest Marshall Howse. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955. $2.50. 158 pages.

Concise Dictionary of Ancient History. Edited by P. G. Woodcock. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. $6.00. 465 pages.

Preach the Word of God. By Frederick M. Morris. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1954. $2.50. 157 pages.

Hinges of Destiny. By Ralph W. Loew. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955. $2.75. 173 pages.

My Spiritual Diary. By Dale Evans Rogers. New York: Fleming Revell Co., 1955. $2.00. 144 pages.

Our Hearts Rejoice. Compiled by John E. Meyer. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1955. $2.00. 175 pages.

The Woman of Tekoah. By Clarence E. Macartney. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955. 160 pages. $2.00.

Vorkuta. By Joseph Scholmer. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1955. $3.75. 304 pages.

Expository Outlines on the Whole Bible (Vol. XI Matthew). By Charles Simeon. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1955 (reprint of 8th edition of 1847). $3.95. 620 pages.

Feeling Low? By Harold E. Kohn. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955. $2.50. 160 pages.

A Light That Shines in Dark Places. By Susan Olyve Eudy. Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1955. $2.50. 68 pages.

Maid of Israel. By Tolbert R. Ingram. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955. $3.00. 270 pages.

The Unbelieving Wife. By Margaret Echard. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955. $3.50. 278 pages.

When a Christian Sins. By John A. Rice. Wheaton, Ill.: The Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1954. 134 pages. $1.75.

Christian Giving. By V. S. Azariah. New York: Association Press, 1955. $1.25. 96 pages.

Mark's Witness to Jesus Christ. By Eduard Lohse. New York: Association Press, 1955. $1.25. 93 pages.

The Christians' God. By Stephen C. Neill. New York: Associated Press, 1955. $1.25. 90 pages.

Christianity and Science. By Charles E. Raven. New York: Association Press, 1955. $1.25. 96 pages.

From Eternity to Eternity. By Erich Sauer. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954. 207 pages. $3.00.

The Billy Graham Story. By Charles T. Cook. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1954. 128 pages. $1.95.

Coals of Fire. By Elizabeth Hershberger Bauman. Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1954 125 pages. $1.95.

Children's Sermons. By Kenneth Brakeley Welles. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 128 pages. $2.00.

Smoke on the Mountain. By Joy Davidman. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953. 139 pages. $2.50.

The Land and the Book. By William M. Thomson. Grand Rapids. Baker Book House, 1954. 718 pages. $4.95.

The Student's Historical Geography of the Holy Land. By William Walter Smith. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954. 65 pages plus pictures and maps. $2.25.

Grugan's God. By Emerson Andrews. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955. 196 pages. $3.00.

The Personality We Have Missed. By Jacob Tanner. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954. 76 pages. $1.25.

The Divine Economy. By A. C. Conrad. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann's Publishing Company. 169 pages. $2.50.

Do You Understand the Bible? By J. Carter Swaim. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 173 pages. $2.50.

From The World of the Cabbalah. By Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 210 pages. $3.00.

Cruden's Unabridged Concordance. By Alexander Cruden. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953. 719 pages. $5.95.

Books Reviewed In This Issue

AUTHOR	TITLE	PAGE
Ahmad, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam:	The Philosophy of the Teachings of Isalm	407
Applegarth, Margaret T.:	Men As Trees Walking	428
Aubrey, Edwin E.:	Secularism a Myth	403
Baillie, John:	A Diary of Readings	428
Baldwin, Leland D.:	The Stream of American History	408
Barton, L. E.:	Amazing Grace	410
Berdyaev, Nicolas:	Christianity and Anti-Semitism	404
Bergevin and Morris:	A Manual for Discussion Leaders and Participants	416
Berkouwer, G. C.:	Faith and Justification	399
Blackwood, Carolyn P.:	How to Be An Effective Church Woman	415
Braden, Charles S.:	War, Communism and World Religions	395
Brewer, J. Mason:	The Word On the Brazos	426
Brodnitz, Friedrich S.:	Keep Your Voice Healthy	428
Browne, Benjamin:	Christian Journalism for Today	413
Burgess, Andrew S.:	Lutheran World Missions	406
Cairns, David S.:	The Image of God in Man	406
Coladarci, Arthur P.:	Educational Psychology	411
Dooyeweerd, Herman:	A New Critique of Theoretical Thought	387
Dowell, Spright:	Columbus Roberts—Christian Steward Extraordinary	419
Edens, B. David:	Sexual Understanding Among Young Married Adults	410
Edman, V. Raymond:	Finney Lives On	418
Edwards, Charles E.:	Devotions and Prayers of John Calvin	428
Embry, John:	The Namic Philosophy	420
Fairweather, A. M.:	Nature and Grace, Vol. XI, Library of Christian Classics	388
Grimm, Harold J.:	The Reformation Era	400
Hanke, Howard A.:	The Virgin Birth of Christ	397
Harris, Errol S.:	Nature, Mind and Modern Science	392
Hartlich and Sachs:	Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffes in der Modernen Bibelwissenschaft	398
Hedley, George:	Christian Worship	416
Heim, Karl:	The Transformation of the Scientific World View	389
Holscher, Gustav:	Das Buch Hiob	396
Hordern, William:	A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology	405
Horney, Karen:	Neurosis and Human Growth	424
Horton, Walter Marshall:	Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach	394
Johnson, Elbert Neil:	The Master Is Here	427
Kauffman, C. C.:	Not Regina	427
Keyes, Kenneth S., Jr.:	How to Develop Your Thinking Ability	418
Kirk, G. S.:	Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments	414
Knight, George A. F.:	Esther, Song of Songs, and Lamentations	402
Kohler, Ludwig:	Theologie des Alten Testaments	395
Kummel, W. G.:	Verheissung and Erfullung	397
Loewenich, Walther von:	Luther's Theologia Crucis	391
McLaughin, P. J. (ed.):	Modern Science and God	405
MacLennan, David A.:	Pastoral Preaching	425
Maves, Paul B. (ed.):	The Church and Mental Health	421
Mourant, John A.:	Readings in the Philosophy of Religion	415
Mueller, William A.:	Church and State in Luther and Calvin	383

AUTHOR	TITLE	PAGE
Nielsen, Eduard:	Oral Tradition	386
Oates, Wayne E.:	Religious Factors in Mental Illness	384
O'Meara, John J. (ed.):	Origen: Prayer; and Exhortation to Martyrdom	398
Osborn, G. Edwin:	Christian Worship, a Service Book	418
Oulton and Chadwick:	Alexandrian Christianty: Selections from Clement and Origen, Vol II, Library of Christian Classics	388
Owen, John:	The Holy Spirit	399
Patterson, Robert Leet:	Irrationalism and Rationalism in Religion	422
Phillips, J. B.:	Appointment with God	417
Pittenger, W. Norman:	The Christian View of Sexual Behavior	423
Robinson, T. H.:	The Old Testament	414
Roth, Leon:	God and Man in the Old Testament	407
Schaff and Wace:	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers	387
Schreiber, Clara S.:	Katherine, Wife of Luther	417
Shaw, J. M.:	Christian Doctrine	400
Shoemaker, Samuel M.:	By the Power of God	414
Soper, David Wesley:	Men Who Shape Belief	403
Stickelberger, Emanuel:	Calvin, a Life	402
Tillich, Paul:	The Shaking of the Foundations	408
Ullmann, Walter:	The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages	402
Walvoord, John F.:	The Holy Spirit	401
Welch, Claude:	In This Name	385
Westberg, Granger:	Nurse, Pastor, and Patient	411
Williamson, Geoffrey:	Inside Buchmanism	423
Wyon, Olive:	The Altar Fire	417
Young, E. J.:	The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel	413
Young, Warren C.:	A Christian Approach to Philosophy	419
Zenkovsky, V. V.:	A History of Russian Philosophy	393
Ziegler, Edward K.:	Rural Preaching	424